

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XV. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1917.

No. 60.

---

## "SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN."

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON'S new book\* has not been hailed by the Press with the shouts of joy, exultation, rapture, and admiration excited by that remarkable "confutation" of what he was pleased to call *The Baconian Heresy*. But from what Baconians have experienced from the Press in general (though gratefully acknowledging several worthy exceptions to the rule), Mr. Robinson's latest reception must be perhaps regarded as testimony to the value of his inquiry. Mr. Robertson knows well enough that his methods of controversy and "citations" in the *Heresy* were often most unjust, if not dishonest, and Sir George Greenwood has the thanks of all lovers of truth and fair play, for the exposures in his unanswered and unanswerable reply included in his book, *Is There a Shakespeare Problem?*

The reason of the very mixed and, on the whole, unpopular reception of this "entirely new thesis in Shakespeare criticism," is not hard to seek. In this *Shakespeare heresy*, Mr. Robertson has come up against the *dicta* of "authority," and his thesis has made it very uncomfortable for the precious reputations of the "men of letters" (the professors of literature). Faith in these gentlemen has become less pronounced in recent

---

\*"Shakespeare and Chapman." By the Right Hon. J. M. Robertson, M.P. (*T. Fisher Unwin*, 10s. 6d. net.)

years, with a growing inclination of the Public to think for themselves. In *The Baconian Heresy*, it was agreed in the Press, which stands as the bulwark of vested interests, that Mr. Robertson had rescued the Shakespeare literature from the usurper Bacon, and had finally established the Stratford maltster on the top of Parnassus.

But this doughty champion, having set "William the Conqueror" on the throne, claims rather a large dukedom for his new favourite, Chapman. He has already written a volume to show that Shakespeare did not write *Titus*, and the leading Shakespeareans have declared that the Henry VI. trilogy is largely Marlowe's work. This, at any rate, saves the embarrassing situation of having to explain how the Stratford rustic so rapidly obtained the command of so many classical allusions, apart from Latin quotations, put into the mouths of the actors. And here, I would say, that it is very perplexing to read another abusive anti-Baconian (Charles Crawford, *Collectanea*, 1906), saying:—

I assert that Marlow had no hand in *Titus Andronicus*, or the various versions of *Henry VI.*; and I am prepared to prove my assertion. In these dramas Marlowe is merely copied by Shakespeare, who is their sole author.

Mr. Robertson's starting point is the poem *A Lover's Complaint*, which he claims to be entirely Chapman's. To him also he assigns the bulk of *Timon of Athens*, and *Troilus and Cressida*; and finds Chapman in (1) *All's Well* ("contains much of Chapman,"—Greene "first draftsman").

(2) *Taming of the Shrew*.—"The bulk" not Shakespeare's,—Chapman and Greene again.

(3) *Henry V.*—"Unquestionably some of Shakespeare's work in it." Traces of Greene, Marlowe, Peele, Chapman.

(4) *Comedy of Errors*.—Suggests Chapman, but admits "the argument is speculative." However, "the mass of non-Shakespearean matter is stubbornly clear."

(5) *Two Gentlemen*.—"Much of it non-Shakespearean." Greene and Chapman are named.

His hand is also found to be indicated in *Pericles*; *Titus*; *Cymbeline*; *Julius Cæsar* (with Ben Jonson); The Masque in *The Tempest*; the Pyrrhus speech in *Hamlet*, and also the "Murder of Gonzago"; the beautiful Dirge and the Vision in *Cymbeline*. On page 249, is the suggestion that Chapman "had a hand in the alteration of *Macbeth*." Some speeches in *Othello* (1-3, 199-219) are likewise mentioned. The Henry VI. trilogy is also among the mixed plays; as is also Richard III., and the novel assertion is made that Clarence's dream is "clearly Marlowe's." Mr. Robertson thinks that Chapman may have shared in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*; *King John* "is slightly brought into the question, and *Henry VIII.* is indicated in the same fashion as regards the Shakespearean portions."\*

Now all this looks very startling and, without reading Mr. Robertson, one might cry out (like the highly respectable Shakespearean who will not soil his fingers and contaminate his mind by the conscientious study of a Baconian book), "absurd!" "mad-house chatter!!" But the eternal question necessarily crops up, "Who was Shakespeare?" To flourish this in the

---

\*Mr. Robertson cannot now give *Titus* to Chapman, for he has already written a book arguing in favour of Peele and Greene, with a smaller share from Kyd. As for the Sonnets, we are mortified to find that "it is obviously impossible to be sure of all," and Mr. Robertson holds that there are more or less grounds for doubt about 5, 128, 135, 136, 143, 145, 153, 154!



eyes of Mr. Robertson is like a red rag to a bull in the arena. But though he often goes out of his way to deliver a furious onslaught against the "Baconists," he has, in spite of his denials, used methods which have been employed by them. When Mr. Robertson subjects "Shakespeare" to "a thorough analysis as regards style, content, and vocabulary," this is called "an inductive inquiry, which leads to the identification of an author," but no condemnation can be strong enough if adopted by a Baconian. "The Baconist method is outside of logic," presumably because he insinuates that Baconians can only have "a boundless ignorance of Elizabethan literature" (p. 57). In his own words (p. 58) Mr. Robertson is qualified to pursue the "rational," while the ignorant Baconian gropes in the darkness with "the irrational use of verbal clues."\* Now this sort of "cavil" is merely childish, and the very limited knowledge of the Baconian theory, and the real Shakespeare Problem, displayed in the *Heresy*, is sufficient to convince us that Mr. Robertson knows little about the work of Baconians. He has never quoted from the pages of BACONIANA, which would enable him to follow the movement year by year, nor does he refer to the books of such erudite Baconians as Edwin Reed, Walter Begley, and others I could name. The reason must be that he has never seen them, and he is therefore not qualified to "confute" the theory. In BACONIANA (July—October, 1906), he will find a very happy solution of the *Lover's Complaint* enigma. The allegorical nature of the poem fully explains the obscure

---

\*Baconians build their theory on broader bases than Mr. Robertson with his Chapman thesis. He has no argument beyond the result of tests of vocabulary and diction. Baconians go beyond these quicksands into the firmer ground of identity of opinion, methods, ideals and purposes between Bacon and Shakespeare.

language, the unusual words, and the inconclusive treatment of the subject. It is not absurd to declare that Francis Bacon was alone capable of inventing this very enigmatical and infolded poem—a story of Mistress Philosophy wooed by the Spirit of Poesy, of Pegasus, Helicon and Parnassus, all under the veil of "love." The same performance is carried out in the "Master-Mistress" sonnets, and if Chapman wrote the *Complaint*, he also wrote the "deep-brain'd sonnets," for by Mr. Robertson's inductive method I should be prepared to show that both proceeded from the same learned brain. Mr. Robertson's amazing theory is that "the *Complaint* was written in direct rivalry with *Lucrece*," with the object of gaining the favour of Lord Southampton. Now one of the characteristics of Chapman, and duly noted by Mr. Robertson, is much circumstance and prolongation of ponderous verse before coming to any point or argument. Chapman would have produced something more formidable in volume than a pastoral of 329 lines as a rival to 1,855 lines of Shakespeare. And if, as Mr. Robertson finds, the *Complaint* is really affected by "a certain laboriousness, a certain cramped, gritty, discontinuous quality," would player Shakespeare who, we are told, inherited a love for litigation from his father, have allowed this poem to be printed with the name "William Shakespeare" to it, and in the same cover as his Sonnets?

Mr. Robertson endeavours to revive the theory that Chapman is the "rival" poet mentioned in the Sonnets, but the case for Chapman depends upon firstly, the "master-mistress" of Shakespeare's "passion" being either Southampton or Pembroke and, that fallacy being accepted, it must be assumed that the Earl had patronised Chapman. As to the first point, I may mention that last year there was published a valuable Variorum Edition of the Sonnets. The



Editor, R. M. Alden, of Stanford University, California, reviews the evidence for and against the Pembroke and the Southampton theories, and concludes his summing up of the latter :—

"Throughout, as with the Pembroke theory, plausible objections are raised at every step, and the whole body of evidence is seen to be circumstantial and inferential."

Mr. Robertson follows Acheson (*Shakespeare and the Rival Poet*, 1903), who had to assume that Chapman sought the patronage of Southampton for his early poems in 1594-1595, and was rejected. We are told (p. 127 of Acheson's book) that his "dedicated words" were "undoubtedly still in MS. when Shakespeare wrote Sonnet 82." For these statements he does not produce a particle of real proof, but later repeatedly refers to it as a known fact.\*

Sir Sidney Lee mentions (*Life*, p. 203) that Chapman "produced no conspicuously great verse until he began his translation of Homer in 1598." In 1610, the complete edition appeared, and among a series of sixteen sonnets appended there was one to Lord Southampton. But, as Sir Sidney Lee points out, "It was couched in terms of formality," and the writer implies that he had had previously no close relations with any of the distinguished noblemen addressed. Neither in the case of Southampton nor Pembroke, is there the slightest evidence of any relationship with Chapman, who was originally brought into the discussion by the Pembrokeists, and it is all a matter of "supposing." Thomas Tyler puts it in this way :—

---

\*It is amusing to find Mr. Acheson referring in his book to the Baconian theory as being "dead." It must have been very much alive since, ten years later, Mr. Robertson thought fit to publish "A Confutation." The Press proclaimed this as the death-knell of Baconianism, but so persistent is truth that nearly every discussion of a Shakespearean subject necessarily mentions "Baconics."

But supposing the Sonnets concerned with the rival-poet to have been written in 1599, Chapman's *Seven Iliades* would have been then a new book, and so would be likely to attract the notice of Herbert, and excite his interest in Chapman.

Mr. Robertson, however, prefers Southampton to Pembroke for Shake-speare's "friend," but he wants to bring in Chapman. This is how it is done :—

Chapman *may have* written a number of early sonnets to Southampton, or, as Mr. Acheson contends, he *may have* praised him in other ways.

How Mr. Robertson would have bludgeoned any Baconian, or indeed anybody else, who happened to introduce such guesswork into any discussion not supporting his opinions !

If, as is now assumed, Shakespeare was quite aware of Chapman's defects, and that, "by accepting collaboration or draftsmanship from Chapman," he was submitting himself to "an artistic tax" in giving such help, and that "Shakespeare must have sighed over the tasks" of trying to make artistic successes of plays which challenged artistic successes (p. 290), it is impossible for me to see how Chapman could have been the "rival" poet of the Sonnets.

How could Chapman (who, Mr. Robertson confesses, in spite of real gifts, had "little moral judgment and no high charm ; and judgment and charm are the two poles of Shakespeare's comedy") be that "worthier pen" of Sonnet 79, whose manner of poesy left Shakespeare "tongue-tied" ? Was Chapman noted for writing :—

In polish'd form of well-refined pen ?

Note how in 85, Shakespeare bows his head to this rival :—

My tongue-tied Muse in manners holds her still,  
While comment of your praise, richly compiled,  
Reserve their character with golden quill  
And precious phrase by all the Muses filed.

I am a worthless boat,  
He of tall building and of goodly pride.—80.

The whole question depends upon the identification of the strange being addressed as Shakespeare's "Master-Mistress,"—"the better part" of him. If, as will one day be universally agreed, he personifies that which Ovid and Horace call "the better part" of themselves, *viz.*, the poetic Genius or intellectual Soul, we may turn to Drayton among his contemporaries who borrowed the device, and strived to eternize what he too calls "my better part." Drayton comes much nearer to Shakespeare in respect of "invention." Meres reports that he was termed "the golden-mouthed, for the purity and preciousness of his style."

If it had suited him, Mr. Robertson could have made out even a better case for Drayton than can be urged for Chapman. Of all the plays with which it is argued Chapman was concerned as first draftsman, the strongest case is made out for *Timon*.\* No fair-minded person could take exception to the supposition in this instance. The inquiry is here carried through by weighing the internal evidence with excellent skill and good judgment, and congratulations are due to

---

\*A large part of the *Baconian Heresy* is an endeavour to trick the reader into the conviction that the author of the Plays had "small Latin and less Greek." There was no question of Chapman then. If Chapman had such a considerable share in them, must not Mr. Robertson retreat on this front. Are there no traces of Chapman's learning? Why, too, with all this collaboration, does not the name of Shakespeare appear, like Chapman, in the pages of Henslow's Diary?



Mr. Robertson for the thorough manner in which he has become familiar with all Chapman's published works. When Bacon was ordered by Queen Elizabeth to discover the author of a seditious pamphlet, as it was called, whom she proposed to put to the torture, he replied, "Nay, Madam, rack not his body—*rack his style*, give him paper and pens; with help of books bid him carry on his tale. By comparing the two parts I will tell you if he be the true man." The *Waverley Novels* were correctly assigned to Scott on the strength of internal evidence. As Spedding says :—

There is a character in language as in handwriting, which it is hardly possible to disguise. Little tricks of thought—little tricks of the hand—peculiarities of which the writer is unconscious, are perceptible by the reader.

The argument for *Timon* is so superior to every other attempt to connect Chapman with "Shakespeare," that I believe with Mr. Robertson. Now *Timon* does not appear to have been known before its inclusion in the Folio, 1623. In certain places, as in certain scenes of Henry VIII., we are reminded forcibly of circumstances attending the fall from power of Lord Chancellor Bacon. We know that Bacon in a letter to Dr. Playfer (1606-7) makes this admission :—

Since I have taken upon me to ring a bell *to call other wits together*, which is the meanest office, it cannot but be consonant with my desire to have that bell heard as far as may be.

As early as 1594 there was a scrivenery of "good pens" under his direction. Bacon alludes to them in a letter to Sir Tobie Matthew in 1623 :—

My labours are now most set to have those works which I had formerly published . . . well translated into Latin by the help of some good pens which forsake me not.

According to Archbishop Tenison, Ben Jonson was one of the group. White, in *Our English Homer* (p. 13), declares that Chapman was "generously patronised by Francis Bacon during his later years."\*

Seeing that Chapman survived Bacon, this must have been during those years between Bacon's fall and his death. What is more likely than that one of Bacon's disciples (his "sons" as he calls them) should prepare a draft of the required play, and that the Master should add the final touches?

Mr. Robertson says at page 56 :—

Baconics take for granted exactly what we are concerned to dispute—the absolute authorship by Shakespeare of all the poems and plays ascribed to him.

I believe there are several Baconians who agree with me that inferior pens are discernible in some of the plays. If Mr. Robertson decides to extend his acquaintance with the arguments of the Baconians,† he will notice in *Is It Shakespeare?* by Mr. Begley, M.A., that this writer says, in respect to Ben Jonson's Epigram on *Poetæpe*, that the evidence "Should prevent Baconians from making the too-wide assertion that Bacon wrote Shakespeare, which we can see plainly from this present Epigram, is not strictly correct" (p. 95).

\*1. This patronage may have inspired Chapman to dedicate his translation of the *Georgicks of Hesiod* (1618), "To the Most Noble Combiner of Learning and Honour, Sir Francis Bacon, Knight."

†2. It is very doubtful, however, if the cause of truth and justice would benefit. Mr. Robertson is only concerned with making Baconians appear ignorant, foolish, and discreditable. So far as this subject is concerned, he has waded into the mire of misrepresentation and cannot get out, being covered with the mud he would aim at others.



While Mr. Begley claims the Poems and Sonnets as unadulterated Bacon, his opinion as to the Plays is that they came "*in the main*" from Francis Bacon.

At page 290 of Mr. Robertson's book, we meet a very startling suggestion, which is that the Stratford player took Chapman under his wing, and was charitable to the poverty-stricken and friendless poet who lamented that the world "ever took with the left hand what he gave with the right." Mr. Robertson goes on to say :—

Shakespeare would not be slack to help a man so placed, if appealed to. As he puts it in his own limpidly beautiful lines :—

The quality of mercy is not strained  
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven  
Upon the place beneath.

Above all, he had no artistic jealousy, herein transcending alike Chapman and Jonson.

It is well known that Shakespeare of Stratford was not to be moved to compassion for those whose fortunes were beneath his own. In Sir Sidney Lee's *Life* we read how he left unpaid the debt contracted by his wife to her father's shepherd; cheated his fellow townsmen over the enclosure of public land; persecuted his debtors, and "avenged himself" on the surety for one who "left the town." Of course, he had no artistic jealousy if he had no artistic talent. But if this man could have written Shakespeare, we may be sure he would have "stood rigorously by his rights" as an author, and would not have allowed his reputation to suffer by having his name set to plays and verses of very inferior wits. If, however, some gentleman, having reasons for concealment, chose the pen-name "William Shakespeare" under which to disperse his poesy, we can realise that he had no choice

in the matter, but to suffer these indignities in silence ; and so Bacon addresses his *alter ego* :—

As every alien pen hath got my use  
And under thee their poesy disperse.

The reviewers, as I have said, were not amorous of Mr. Robertson's deductions, and complain of the methods he employs. Professor Saintsbury writes in the *Bookman* (July, 1917) :—

Mr. Robertson . . . even thinks that the case for Chapman's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* is made out "decisively," and that the case for his origination of *Timon* "substantially," here. This seems to the present reviewer to be an instance of the damaging effect which this kind of inquiry has upon the enquirer. It is doubtless by no means certain—indeed there is hardly any evidence and very little probability—that Shakespeare wrote *A Lover's Complaint*, and Chapman might very conceivably have written it. But to establish authorship decisively needs evidence of which one fairly careful and critically exercised reader can find nothing in Mr. Robertson's book. As for the case of *Timon*, one must without flippancy say that "shadow" would be a much better word than "substance." . . . Two points in Mr. Robertson's very interesting book remain to be noticed. He is much too acute not to perceive that his method is liable to be confused with that of the Baconians. In fact, it is that of the lamented Mrs. Pott. . . . He speaks of their "infinite mania for assigning to Bacon the bulk of Elizabethan literature." Far be it from us to accuse him of any mania. But does not his own method lead to assigning the composition of "Shakespeare" to the majority of Elizabethan dramatists ?

Here Professor Saintsbury touches a very intricate and far-reaching problem. In *The Shakespeare Symphony* (1906), Mr. Harold Bayley quotes the opinions and ideals of Francis Bacon and the dramatists. The preface to this work prepares us for the sensational conclusion at which the author arrives at page 355 :—

I do not maintain that Bacon was the concealed author of



all the plays from which I have quoted extracts ; but for many of them he will, I believe, ultimately be found to have been responsible ; and for others his disciples could probably have rendered some account. In Sculpture, Painting and Literature, nothing is more perilous than to be dogmatic in differentiating between the authentic works of a Master, and the imitations of his own School.

Mr. Bayley proves that a group of exalted Artists produced “ entire Symphonies uniform with each other, not merely in leading movements, but incidentally phrase for phrase and bar for bar, even to faulty progression and false relation,—such a paradox seemingly exceeds all reason.” By “ the dramatists ” Mr. Bayley is careful to point out that he means *some* of them, and seems to suggest that the touch of the Master is visibly impressed upon their pages :—

Few things are more bewildering than the manner in which trash and sublimity rub shoulders with each other.

*The Contemporary Review* (August, 1917) confirms Mr. Bayley’s great discovery though it does not acknowledge his work. Speaking of Mr. Robertson on “ the marks of Chapman,” the reviewer says :—

The passages quoted in support of these “ marks ” have a strangely Shakespearean sound. The truth is that the *musical note* or mark of the age is common to all (*sic*) the poets of the period. . . . Mr. Robertson makes us see the Chapman touch wandering into the most sacred and unsuspected places.

Mr. Robertson makes a brief mention of Mr. Bayley’s book in the *Heresy* (though he ignores it in his present book), so he is doubtless familiar with its contents. However, at the risk of wearying the readers of *BACONIANA* with repetition, I should like to point to some of the extracts quoted under various headings

for Bacon, Shakespeare and Chapman among others :—

He was a *prince*, sad, serious, and full of thoughts.

Bacon (*Henry VII.*), 1621.

How is the King employed ?

I left him private, full of sad thoughts.

(*Henry VIII.*, II-2), 1623.

Alas, good prince . . . so full of serious thoughts.

Chapman (*Revenge for Honour*), 1654.

The dramatic conception of a Prince is that embodied in *Hamlet*, sad, serious, and full of thought.

---

At pages 171 and 258 Mr. Robertson quotes the word "excrement" as a mark of Chapman, and quotes *Comedy of Errors* :—

Why is Time such a niggard of hair, being, as it is, so plentiful an excrement ?

Mr. Bayley does not quote Chapman as using the word in its strictly classical meaning, "outgrowth," but Bacon has :—

Hair and nails . . . are excrements (*Sylva Sylvarum*), 1627.

---

The office of medicine is but to tune this curious harp of man's body and reduce it to harmony.

Bacon (*Advancement of Learning*), 1605.

The man that hath no music in himself

Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils.

(*Merchant of Venice*), 1600.

O innocence  
himself.

that makes a man in tune still with

Chapman (*Conspiracy of Byron*), 1608.



But to continue quoting such instances of harmony in thought (combined often in identical diction) would fill up very many pages. Mr. Bayley's book has an excellent index, and by turning to Chapman, whose name and works figure prominently throughout, we find him sharing opinions with Bacon, Shakespeare, and others, upon such widely scattered subjects as :—

- Sense and Motion, p. 184.
- Ambition, p. 122.
- Circumstance tedious, p. 313.
- Nothing made out of nothing, p. 259.
- The Sun—an Eye, p. 261.
- The Brain, a Forge, p. 287.
- Innocence a Guard, p. 234.
- One Nail expelling another, p. 241.
- The Multitude, pp. 158-9.
- Putting a Girdle round the World, p. 259.
- Man—a Candle, p. 235.
- False Fire, pp. 266-7.
- Buzzes, pp. 267-8.
- Metaphors from Art of Grafting, p. 320.
- Writ in water, p. 184.

Another list can be compiled of similar instances, where Shakespeare and Chapman are quoted without Bacon, and again where Chapman and Bacon appear without Shakespeare. The names which are most frequently called in, as endorsing opinions on the various subjects, are Bacon, Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Nash, Lily, Beaumont and Fletcher, Chapman, Dekker, Marston, Kyd, Heywood, Webster, Tourneur, Middleton, Ford, Shirley, Robert Burton, Sir Thomas Browne. It would not be a difficult task for a good controversialist to make out a case for any of these poets and writers as having had a share in Shakespeare, or even in each other's writings. Some Baconians maintain that Bacon was responsible for the

works published under certain of these names. It is impossible to deny that a group of writers and poets was informed of the matter existing in Bacon's mind and helped to circulate his opinions. No poet gilded the philosophic pill with a covering so sweet to the taste as "Shakespeare." He is univcrasly proclaimed the *Master* among these skilled musicians. One can only gasp in astonishment that such a broad-minded man as Mr. Robertson should have bound himself with the fetters of the wretched Stratford tradition, that the player and, doubtless, "deserving man" was "the best head" in that Universe. Whoever "Shakespeare" may have been, he was superbly conscious of his superiority :—

I all other in all worths surmount.—S. 62.

And my great mind most kingly drinks it up.—S. 114.

And Bacon commended greatness of mind as a supreme virtue, speaking of it in this way :—

I know his virtues and that namely that he hath much greatness of mind which is a thing almost lost among men.

(Letter to Tobie Matthew, 1620.)

Dean Church observes that Bacon "never affected to conceal from himself his superiority to other men, in his aims and in the grasp of his intelligence." It was enough if "Francis of Verulam thought thus," and so in the self-assertion of Shakespeare—"I am that I am" (Sonnet, 121).

Bacon's contemporaries knew him to be the guiding-star of literature and poetry in his age. The writers of the *Manes Verulamiani* (1626) not only acknowledge this, but they add that Francis Bacon was *decima Musa* (the tenth Muse), and the leader of the choir (*decusque chori*), who filled the world with his writings and the ages with his glory (*Replesti mundum scriptis et saecula fama*), but who had not claimed all he had given to the world and the Muses :—

Si repetes quantum mundo Musisque (Bacone), Donasti, &c.

One of these elegists includes *dramatic Poetry*—Tragedy and Comedy—among the activities of this “other Apollo.” After comparing Philosophy as wandering about, like Eurydice, in search of a deliverer, and finding her Orpheus in Bacon, he goes on :—

tali manu lactata extulit philosophia . . . humique  
soccis reptitantem comicis restauravit. Hinc politius surgit  
cothurno celsiore, et Organo Stagiritæ virbius revivis cit novo.

What, I would ask, does this mean if Bacon did not seek to deliver true philosophy from the subtleties of the schoolmen, by the aid of the lowly socks of Comedy, and the loftier tragic buskin ; in other words, by commending her to the minds of all men by means of poetry and the stage ? Where are the fruits of this industry if not in Shakespeare, whose plays supply in detail and treatment the missing Fourth Part of Bacon’s *Instauration* ? Will Mr. Robertson supply the answers, or will he continue to ignore the real argument ? There is no mention of the *Manes Verulamiani* in his *Baconian Heresy* !

Ben Jonson confirms that Bacon was the only leader and director of the literary fraternity : “ *He it is that hath filled up all numbers and performed that in our tongue which may be compared and preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome. In short, within his view, and about his times, were all the wits born that could honour a language, or help study. Now things daily fall, wits grow downward, eloquence grows backward, so that he may be named and stand as the mark and acme of our language.*”

As every Baconian knows, the comparison with insolent Greece and haughty Rome was applied by Ben Jonson to his beloved the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare, in 1623, whom he also named as the mark



and acme of dramatic poetry, imploring the departed poet to return again "to chide and cheer the drooping stage," which since his flight from its domains had "mourned like night." What a misfortune Ben Jonson and his fellows allowed this essential genius to retire to Stratford in 1611, and spend the rest of his life in pursuits morally and intellectually opposed to poetic productiveness!

That performance in the English tongue with which Jonson credits Shakespeare-Bacon can only refer to the systematic development of the language carried out by Bacon, and by the "wits" helping in this study during the period 1579-1623. In Caliban we have a personification of the Elizabethan masses, the "dung scum rabble" (Marston); the ignorant and rude multitude, the vulgar (*Bacon*); the natural depravity and malignant disposition of the vulgar (*Bacon*); the mutable, rank-scented many (*Shakespeare*); the wild monster multitude (*Ford*); the credulous beast, the multitude (*Beaumont and Fletcher*); the staggering multitude (*Marston*); that wide-throated beast (Middleton); the rude multitude . . . gaping for the spoil (Heywood); the idolatrous vulgar (Marston).

Surely a very good character sketch of Caliban! "Shakespeare" himself speaks through the mouth of Prospero:—

Thou most lying slave,  
Whom stripes may move, not kindness! I have used thee  
Filth as thou art, with human care . . . .  
. . . . . Abhorred slave  
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,  
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,  
*Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour*  
*One thing or other*: when thou did'st not, savage  
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like  
A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes  
With words that made them plain.

R. L. EAGLE.

## BACON'S DEATH AND BURIAL.

IN the year 1631, the very year in which the strange letter, *Meautys to Bacon\**, was written, just five years after Bacon's death, in 1626 (for convenience' sake I will speak of his death as having occurred in that year) there appeared in Paris, and in French, a *Life of Bacon*. This was the first to appear; and for many years—until 1657—was the only life† that the world had of Bacon, and the only account of him and his works. It is somewhat strange that this first life should have appeared in a French dress, and that there was no Englishman sufficiently interested in the great man to bring out a life of him with equal promptitude; a life that, one would have thought, would have been eagerly read by all the Bacon admirers in England. What were Rawley and Jonson about that their pens should have been idle on this occasion? Why did they not give the world what they knew about the great man whom they so intensely admired? True Rawley, at last, in 1657, brought out a *Life of Bacon*, but he had allowed himself to be forestalled these many years by a nameless French writer, and had not cared to win the honour of being the first to celebrate the Master, whom to serve he had been so proud. It must not be supposed from this, however, that the French *Life* was some slight production, lightly passed over by the literary world of the time. It is quoted by Gilbert Wats, who brought out the translation—the first appearance in English dress—of

---

\* *BACONIANA*, July, 1916.

† Except a very short notice of him, by his servant, Peter Boerner, that came out in 1647, in Leyden, in Dutch.

Bacon's "*De Augmentis Scientiarum*," in 1640; and is spoken of by him as a "just and elegant discourse upon the Life" of Bacon.\* This French Life had formed a preface to a French "*Histoire Naturelle*," which professed to have been translated into French from Bacon's English, by Pierre Amboise, and the whole work was brought out in Paris in 1631. Though the translator speaks of the English original as though it could be compared with the French, nothing of this English edition is known. The book is not in any sense a translation of Bacon's "*Sylva Sylvarum*." I have dealt with this at some length in my book, "*Bacon's Secret Disclosed*." This "*Histoire Naturelle*" was in after years (1652 and onwards) the subject of correspondence between Isaac Gruter and Rawley†; and though they seemed to have some latent objection to the book, they yet were unwilling or unable to state what the objection was, and they were curiously ignorant of the name of the French sponsor for the book—very curious, one must consider this, when one remembers how small was the literary world of those days—and always speak of him as "the Frenchman," though the book itself puts forward Pierre Amboise as the sponsor; and were ignorant also of the English originals from which the French translation was said to have been made. This, I think, very noteworthy, for if anyone should have known about Bacon's writings and his literary remains, surely it would have been Rawley. But this French translation with the Life prefixed, comes out only five years after Bacon's "death," and Rawley does not know where the English original comes from!—and the

---

\* See "*Bacon's Secret Disclosed*," Gay & Hancock, London, 1911.

† See Tenison's "*Baconiana*," 1679, p. 221 to 237.



French translator, furthermore, has the hardihood to say that where he differs from Rawley he is to be taken as the more correct as he had the better information.\* Yet after all this when he is so plainly "flouted," Rawley has neither the courage nor the "*mens sibi conscia recti*" to induce him to come out in his "Life of Bacon," published in 1657, and show where the French life was wrong, or where the "Histoire Naturelle" was unauthorised. Indeed, in Rawley's "Life of Bacon," he absolutely ignores the French life, which after what had passed between him and Isaac Gruter on the subject, as is shown in the letters Tenison published in 1679, is very astonishing. But as we go on to investigate and enquire into Baconian affairs, subsequent to 1626, we will find that there were other things intimately connected with Bacon, with which Rawley had nothing to do, and where he seems to have been pushed to one side. For one thing it seemed to have been the *mot d'ordre* of the Rawley party to ignore all the French side of Bacon's life, and subsequent English writers seem to have followed Rawley's lead. From Mallet, writing in 1740, to the more recent Montague and Spedding, and on to Bacon's latest biographers, James Robertson and G. Walter Steeves, none take any notice of, or seem at all to be aware of, the "Histoire Naturelle," and the French Life prefixed to it; though Gilbert Wats, in 1640, had certified to its importance by quoting it. Biographers who investigate so slightly will not discover much truth. Until the Revd. Walter Begley called attention to this "Histoire Naturelle," in his "Nova Resuscitatio,"† no modern Englishman had considered it; and I

---

\* Bacon's Secret Disclosed, p. 48.

† Gay & Bird, London, 1905.

believe that the Translation of the "Life" given in my "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," was actually the first rendering of this into English that had ever been published. A record of neglect such as this does not impress one greatly with the powers of research of the modern English writers on Bacon.

There has been a copy of the "Histoire Naturelle" in the British Museum since about 1820. It forms part of the Banksian collection. At one time I owned two copies, and still possess one. It is a book *sui generis*, and in no sense a transcript or translation of Bacon's "Sylva Sylvarum."

What are the salient features of this 'French life' ? \*

First of all, one is struck by the absence from it of those fundamental things that one would expect to find in a Life. There are no dates of either birth or death ; there is no statement of the place of either birth or death ; the name of either father or mother is not once mentioned ; it is only "son pere" that is spoken of ; there is no mention of places of residence. And yet though the Life is extraordinarily lacking in these matters it shows an intimate knowledge of the private and retired—one might almost say—the inmost matters of the man with whom it deals. It tells us in the most assured way what were the private thoughts and intentions of Bacon when he was a young man. It tells us of his having spent some years of his early life in travel in France, Italy and Spain, and it gives further the reason that actuated Bacon in thus travelling ; that he might observe the manners and customs, and modes of Government of the various peoples among whom he sojourned, and thus the better fit himself for the business of governing. And why should he fit himself for governing ? Because

---

\* See preceding article.

he "saw himself" (as a youth, remember) "*destined* at some day to hold in his hand the helm of the Kingdom." What Frenchman could have so intimate a knowledge of Bacon's inmost affairs as to be able to write in this way? All this is very different from the bald and meagre information vouchsafed by Rawley, when he undertook to write the Life brought out in the Resuscitatio of 1657. But then Rawley, in his Preface, warns us that he will not tread too near upon the heels of Truth, and indeed in some instances I suspect he has given Truth a very wide berth. He tells us nothing about Bacon having travelled in Italy and Spain, he says nothing about the reasons that, as a young man, weighed with him in making his journeys, but he has a lot of harmless and not very informing bits of information that must have been well known to all those about Bacon or even to his contemporaries generally; any intimate knowledge about the man is withheld as probably being too close upon the heels of Truth. And who of all those about Bacon would we expect to be able to tell us intimate things about him, if not Rawley? But "the Frenchman," whom Rawley and Gruter pretend to despise, but whom they dare not contradict; this Frenchman comes out boldly about Bacon and give us information concerning him that only the most intimate and private knowledge could supply. It is impossible to believe that "this Frenchman," possessed as he was of this intimate knowledge of Bacon's private thoughts, did not know the ordinary facts of his life, such as the date of his birth and death, the names of his Father and Mother, the places of his residence, etc.; but for some good and sufficient reasons he does not give these—details which Rawley revels in with expansive delight—but goes on to other private and reserved matters.



The French Life, given in translation in the July BACONIANA preceding, should be carefully read and studied in order to catch the full flavour of what I say, but I would refer particularly to what the writer—Pierre Amboise, or whoever he was—says about the letter that Bacon wrote to King James and which at last gained for him the King's pardon, accompanied by a small pension. This Life—be it remembered—was published in 1631, and at that date it was quite impossible that this letter could have been open to the public. And yet the writer of the Life has complete knowledge of it, and speaks of it in a thoroughly intimate manner. Such knowledge was not extant in England at that time, and was not completely extant until 1702, when the letter was published in its entirety by Stephen. It was *alluded* to by Howells, and quoted from by him, in his letters published in 1645, and Howells, from his position of Clerk to the Council (1642-1643) might very possibly have seen the letter itself, and thus been able to quote from it. But at this much earlier date, 1631, this letter was familiar to the French author, and he had evidently been fully informed about it. I think this in itself shows how completely the Frenchman was in possession of facts about Bacon.

I would also draw attention to a passage in the Life, p. 139, where it is said :—

“ But as he seemed to have been born rather for the rest of mankind than for himself, and as by the want of public employment he could not give his work to the people, he wished at least to render himself of use by his writings and by his books.”

The sentiment is thoroughly Baconian, and quite in accord with what I have suggested as the feelings that were guiding and governing Bacon when going into retirement,—retirement, that is, after 1626.

But a part of the "Life" to which I wish to call special attention is that where "the Frenchman" comes to speak of Bacon's death. For it is here that we find him avoiding in that marked way to be noted in many references to Bacon, any direct mention of "Death" or "Dead," in regard to him. Why should there be any difficulty about saying he was dead—if such were actually the case—or why should there be any mystifying reticence about it? But what "the Frenchman" says to convey to his readers the notion of Bacon's death is:—

"The cold, acting the more easily on a body whose powers were already reduced by old age, drove out all that remained of natural heat, and reduced him to the last condition that is always reached by great men only too soon."

This is all that "the Frenchman" says, and with these vague and roundabout phrases tells us—or gets us to surmise—that Bacon died; though where, or when, he says not. This mystifying sort of reticence is quite of a piece with what can be seen in the "Manes Verulamiani"; there, it was, I think, distinctly visible that Bacon's nearest and most intimate friends avoided saying that he was dead, and refrained from pouring out funeral dirges over him. Sir Henry Wotton, Sir Tobie Matthew, Sir Thomas Meautys, and Ben Jonson, all very close intimates of Bacon, contributed nothing to these Manes. (See translation by W. J. Sutton, S.J., in Vols. III., IV. and V., *BACONIANA* 1905-6-7.) Rawley contributes an "Address to the Reader," but he does not speak of "death." He goes no further than to say "these tokens of love and memorials of sorrow prove how much *his loss* grieves their heart"; and *loss* may mean retirement. Boswell contributes an elegy headed, "To the Memory and Merits of the Right Hon. Lord, Francis," &c., and

"death" or "dead" do not occur in it. And I think the true reason for this curious reticence was the simple fact that he was not dead, and that this fact was known to some few of his trusted intimates.

It has frequently been pointed out that we have no account anywhere of Bacon's funeral. Rawley says nothing about it in 1657, nor does Fuller in his "Worthies," in 1662; nor Lloyd, in his "Statesmen and Favourites," in 1665; nor Will Winstanley, in "England's Worthies," in 1684.

Lloyd, in his *Life of Sir Julius Cæsar*, in the "Statesmen and Favourites," 1665, has a curious remark about Bacon, giving a "variant" as to his place of death, though in the *Life of Bacon* himself, he gives the story of his dying at Lord Arundel's house in Highgate; this latter is in Lloyd's second Edition of 1670, in the first Edition of 1665, in *Bacon's Life*, he does not give the Highgate story. What Lloyd says in his *Life of Sir Julius Cæsar* is:—

"Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, was judicious in his election, when perceiving his Dissolution to approach. he made his last bed, in effect, in the house of Sir Julius."

Possibly the phrase "his last bed in effect" may mean that at the time of his visit to Highgate he was residing in Sir Julius Cæsar's house, and there is some confirmation of this to be found in Lloyd's remarks about Bacon, in his *Life of him*, where he says:—

" . . . Though this peerless Lord is much admired by Englishmen, yet he is more valued by Strangers: distance as the Historian hath it, diminishing his Faults to Foreigners, while we behold his perfections abated with his failings; which set him as much below pity, as his Place did once above it: Sir Julius Cæsar (they say) looking upon him as a burden in his family, and the Lord Brooke denying him a bottle of small beer."



It is indeed a pitiable object that Lloyd sets before us in these few lines, and there is little to wonder at if Bacon did—as I suppose—find a “way out” on the occasion of his visit to Highgate. But the remark “a burden in his Family” may, I think, be intended to imply that Bacon was residing with Sir Julius Cæsar at that time. There is no information as to where Francis Bacon lived in 1626, though there is a letter from him to Secretary Conway, dated 26th January, 1626 (new style) from Gray’s Inn. However that may be, it is thus that the facts of the case stand, as I have been able to extract them. But with all the writing there has been round and about Bacon’s demise, there is none of the writers who has told us about a funeral procession from Highgate to St. Michael’s Church, at St. Albans, a subject that must have appealed to the feelings of his friends if it had taken place. Rawley, it is to be noted, says nothing about it. And as a definite addition to this little cloud of mystery, when one goes to St. Albans to examine the records of burials for the period about 1626, one finds that the pages referring to that time have been removed, so that nothing is to be found recorded about Bacon. So often in this Baconian investigation this is the sort of thing that happens. The main line of investigation fails for some reason ; one looks for bypaths for corroboration, and one finds that they are obstructed or destroyed, just at the very place where one expects they would lead to definite information.

All the registers of St. Michael’s have disappeared previous to 1643, but transcripts of the same are in the Archdeaconry Court of St. Albans Abbey from 1572 to 1600, and from 1629 to 1630. Even in the transcript, however, there is a gap from 1600 to 1628 ; the registers of this period are missing. There is

thus no record of Lady Anne Bacon's burial on 30th August, 1610, nor that of Francis in 1626. I suggest that the explanation of this hiatus in the registers is, that the pages were removed in order to hide what would be a most difficult fact to account for in a reasonable way, viz., that there was in reality and very truth no record of the burial of Bacon in the Church in 1626, or any subsequent year, and that for the very good reason that he was not buried there. It was easier to remove the pages and blur the evidence in that way, than to manage a fictitious entry of burial. And so we have the gap in the Register. It may be called to mind that in the register of Bacon's birth, to be seen in the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, there are peculiarities that have been the subject of discussion. Had the record of his burial been clouded in a similar manner, there would have been too much for suspecting eyes to feed on. So the best plan would be to tear the pages out and leave people to wonder what had become of them.

There was another official source that might be expected to give some information about Bacon's funeral; and that was the Records of the Corporation of St. Albans. Bacon had been appointed Counsel to the Borough in 1612; Recorder, 1st February, 1613; High Steward, 18th September, 1616, and had been three times elected Member of Parliament for the City, in 1601, 1604, and 1614. On none of these occasions, however, did he sit for St. Albans; in 1601 and 1604 he elected to sit for Ipswich, for which place he had also been chosen, and in 1614 he sat for Cambridge University. It would be natural under these circumstances to expect that the Records would record something about the funeral of a man who had been so great in the Great World and had been so intimately connected with the Corporation; but there is not a word. And the silence is significant.

I am indebted to Mr. Charles H. Ashdown, F.R.G.S., a resident of St. Albans, for the foregoing facts in regard to the Register of Burials and the Corporation Records.

But there was a monument put up to Bacon in St. Michael's by the care and affection of his secretary, Sir Thomas Meautys, and this was inscribed with an epitaph composed in Latin by another of Bacon's truest friends, Sir Henry Wotton. What does this tell us? The epitaph is as follows:—

FRANCISCVS BACON BARO DE VERULAM ST. ALBANI VICECOMES  
SEU NOTIORIBUS TITULIS  
SCIENTIARUM LUMEN FACUNDIÆ LEX  
SIC SEDEBAT

— — — — —  
QUI POSTQUAM OMNIA NATURALIS SAPIENTIÆ  
ET CIVILIS ARCANA EVOLVISSET  
NATURÆ DECRETUM EXPLÈVIT  
COMPOSITA SOLVANTUR  
ANO DNI MDCXXVI  
ÆTAT LXVI  
TANTI VIRI  
MEM  
THOMAS MEAUTUS  
SUPERSTITIS CULTOR  
DEFUNCTI ADMIRATOR  
H P

The first thing that strikes one about this epitaph is the absence of the almost universally used "Hic Jacet"; instead of that we have the very unusual expression, "Sic sedebat," "Thus he used to sit." This seems to suggest to the reader that "Here lies" would possibly be an incorrect statement, and therefore the inference would be plain that Bacon does not lie there. But still more unusual and provocative is the expression: "Naturæ decretum explèvit, composita solvantur," "He fulfilled the decree of Nature, Let the compounds be dissolved."



It is strange indeed that so very unusual a phrase as "Composita solvantur" should be employed to tell us that Bacon died in 1626, and this phrase may mean something else than death, and in any case we cannot but be struck with the fact that this Epitaph carefully avoids any expression of "death" or "died." It is also to be noted that the date on the tablet is simply the year 1626. Almost invariably on such a monumental tablet the month and the day of the month on which death occurred is given as well as the year.

But we have been favoured with what may be called an "official translation" of the above Latin epitaph. This came out in *BACONIANA*, published in 1679. This book is a very important one in any research into Bacon's life. Though anonymous, it has been attributed to Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury.

The "official translation" has been set out by the translator with much care and arranged by him in definite paragraphs, with punctuation that one must see is the result of consideration. I give this translation in the form, with paragraphs and punctuation, as it appears on p. 259 of the *BACONIANA* of 1679, and also with all the words in italics that are there in that type. It is as follows:—

*Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam,  
Viscount of St. Albans : Or in more  
conspicuous Titles ;  
The Light of Sciences, the Law of Elo-  
quence, sate on this manner.*

*Who, after he had unfolded all the Myster-  
ies of Natural and Civil Wisdom, o-  
beyed the Decree of Nature*

*Let the Companions be parted,\* in the Year  
of our Lord 1626, and the Sixty sixth  
Year of his Age.*

---

\* i.e., Soul and Body.

*Thomas Meautys*, a Reverencer of him whilst Alive, and an Admirer of him now dead, hath set up this to the Memory of so great a Man.

Now "every schoolboy" knows that "*Composita solvantur*" cannot by any twisting sustain the translation, "Let the companions be parted." No one can bring forward any instance in Latin literature where the word, "*Composita*" is used as meaning "Companions." True, the Translator puts in a marginal gloss as an explanation of *composita*, "*i.e.*, soul and body," but this is merely dust thrown in people's eyes. Had Sir Henry Wotton intended to say in Latin, "Let the companions be parted," he could easily have found Latin words to say it, and then the marginal note would have been in proper order. He does not say it, however, but the translator gives the unreal translation of "*composita solvantur*" in order to say what Sir Henry Wotton had in his mind to say—but dared not—and to tell enquirers after the truth, that what happened in 1626 was that the "Companions (*i.e.*, Bacon and his friends) were parted"; and that what was given out to the world as "Death" was only separation. I think this translation is a very remarkable piece of cunning. Just as Bacon, in his last letter to Lord Arundel, plainly tells him that the time he spent at his house in Highgate was occupied in making experiments so as to render bodies incapable of feeling—a work that would have to be undertaken for his own sham death; so here the translator plainly says that what happened in 1626 was that the companions were parted. There was no word about "death" or "dying," but merely a parting of the companions.

Note, too, how this clause in the translation is most significantly put by itself in a separate paragraph,

and that the important words are in italics, so as to draw attention to them. I think it is most evident that these words are intended to mean what they say and that the meaning I give is that which was intended by the translator.

I am not aware that this translation has been adopted by any other writers on Bacon. Those who came after *BACONIANA* could not squeeze their Latin to such an extent as to get this meaning out of it, and at the same time, they had not perceived what was in Tenison's mind that had made him so free with his translation.

I think that the consideration of all this should convince any unbiassed mind that here there was a strong effort being made to give a definite hint to enquirers, of what had actually happened in 1626. By the year 1679 the complications that would arise, if the truth were known, would be much reduced, and therefore less harm would be done in allowing it to leak out.

There had been a previous attempt made—at least so I take it—to put enquirers on some right path for discovery ; but possibly this had been too subtle to be understood or made use of, and in subsequent years the use of it was made impossible by certain changes that took place. It is a very curious and instructive happening that I am about to relate.

In the 1640 Edition of the "Advancement of Learning," that which is a translation by Gilbert Wats of Bacon's 1623 "*De Augmentis Scientiarum*," there is a long series of "fore words"—laudatory poems, pleasing references and so forth, to Bacon from other writers—occupying 17 pages at the beginning of the Book. On the last of these pages there occurs—



standing alone and separate from the context—the following Latin sentence :—

“ Ordine Sequeretur descriptio Tumuli Verulamiani monumentum Nobiliss : Mutisii, in honorem domini sui constructum ; qua pietate, et dignitatem Patroni sui, quem (quod rari faciunt, etiam post cineres coluit) consuluit ; Patriæ suæ opprobrium diluit ; sibi nomen condidit. Busta hæc nondum invisit interpres, sed invisurus, Interim lector tua cura commoda et abi in rem tuam.”

This Latin is somewhat crabbed and difficult, but I submit the following translation, wherein I have taken the liberty of moving the position of the bracket, and placing it before instead of after “ quem.”

“ The delineation (exposition) of the tomb of Verulam will follow in order that of the most illustrious Meautys, erected by him in honour of his Master ; by which piety, also for the worthiness of his Patron (whom he revered even after his death, a thing which few do) he shewed regard ; he blotted out the reproach of his Country, and founded a name for himself. The Interpreter (explainer ? decipherer ?) has not yet cast an eye upon these tombs, but he will look into them. In the meantime, oh ! Reader, mind thy affairs, and go about thy business.”\*

It is quite evident I think that the main purpose of the Latin paragraph inserted as I have described, was to connect the two memorial epitaphs of Bacon and Meautys, and to direct attention to the fact that that of Meautys would in some way explain that of Bacon ; or at any rate that the two should be considered together as having some direct bearing, the one on the other, and that the one would be an exposition of the other. The mere fact that the epitaphs of Bacon and Meautys are brought together in this

---

\* See also “ The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon,” p. 141, by Harold Bayley : Grant Richards, London, 1902.

way at the end of the "forewords" of such a book as "The Advancement of Learning," is extremely significant. There was nothing in the remotest degree calling for any allusion to these memorials at such a time and in such a place, and this paragraph is dragged in "*apropos de rien*." But the natural inference that one is forced to draw is that the composer of this paragraph had in his mind two things; first, that Sir Henry Wotton's epitaph on Bacon was not plain and clear, but contained things that required explaining, and which would certainly raise questions in the minds of future readers. And second: That the epitaph to Sir Thomas Meautys contained in it something that would explain and clear away the difficulties that would be aroused by the reading of Bacon's epitaph. What other inference can one draw but this? We are entitled to assume that the Author of the 1640 "Advancement of Learning" was not actuated by mere foolishness when he inserted his curious paragraph, that has no bearing whatever on the work he has in hand, but that it was put in with a definite purpose; and what could that purpose be, unless it were that the Meautys' epitaph was in some sort a commentary upon and explanation of Bacon's earlier and somewhat puzzling epitaph.

I am sure that it is no straining of the imagination to say that any one who was interested in Bacon, had read his epitaph and puzzled over the curious phrases, "*Sic sedebat*" and "*Composita solvantur*," remembering, too, that this very monument to Bacon had been put up by Sir Thomas Meautys, would, on reading and comprehending this Latin paragraph, directing attention to Meautys' epitaph as a commentary on Bacon's, immediately go and search out Meautys' tomb to ponder over and study it. And what would he find? That the whole epitaph has been carefully

defaced by a chisel, or some other sharp instrument! In the whole range of weird puzzles surrounding Bacon, there is nothing, I think, that takes one's breath away as this does. One has been led on step by step in the task of endeavouring to let light in upon the dark places, and to find confirmation, or denial, of theories that have naturally arisen. The absence of the pages in the register was startling, but that *might* have been caused by something different than one supposed. But the direction to Meautys' epitaph seems definite and certain—and then it is found defaced! and one is baulked again of any explanation.

The tomb of Meautys is in reality merely a slab covering his grave. This slab lies in front of the Communion table of the little St. Michael's Church and almost in front of, and close to, Bacon's monument.

I have endeavoured to find some contemporary account or record of Meautys' epitaph, but there does not seem to be any. The later editions of Weever's "Funeral Monuments" (the first edition would be too early, being 1631) would be likely places in which to find some allusion to it, but there is none. Dingley's "Historie from Marble," compiled from notes gathered by Dingley between 1640-80 is another likely place, but there is nothing to be found here. Both these books are also curiously lacking in any record of, or account of Bacon's monument and tomb. One would have thought that Dingley's facile pencil would certainly have given us a sketch of Bacon's beautiful and pathetic monument, and that Dingley would have had something to say about the epitaph; but as so often occurs in these Bacon matters, there is silence.

I have carefully examined the Meautys slab. The first line of the epitaph:—



" Here lyeth the bodie of St. "

is quite clear and distinct. The next words, " Thomas Meautys," have been cut into and much injured, but can still be made out ; all the rest is quite removed. The cutting, or chiselling, is very plain, just about the name " Thomas Meautys " ; below this the wear of feet passing over the slab has worn the stone quite smooth, and has worn out the chisel cuts almost entirely, except one or two indentations where the chisel has " gouged out " the stone deeper than in other places. There is no record or tradition of when this was done. The fact that the stone is worn so smooth would show that it had been done many years ago. The place where the cutting marks are most clearly to be seen, at the top of the stone, is out of the line of passer's feet and therefore was not subject to wear, but lower down the wear would take place more rapidly, and all the more rapidly because the surface had been broken by the chisel cuts. In any case, however, it must have taken a very long time for the epitaph and the chisel cuttings to get worn out as they are to-day.\*

And so this extraordinary puzzle stands. The inscription that might have explained Bacon's curious epitaph, and thrown some light on the phrase, " Let

---

\* Mr. C. H. Ashdown, of St. Albans, in a letter to me of the 10th July, 1913, says :—" I am pleased to hear your report upon the Meauty's slab ; it certainly coincides with my own conclusions from investigations " : while under 15th June he wrote to me :—" The information *re* 1640 Edition of " *Avancement of Learning* ' is most suggestive, and was unknown to me."

When I went to see the Meautys slab in July, 1913, I remarked to the Verger, who showed me the church, that the slab had a strange appearance, and asked what had caused the inscription to disappear ? He answered : " It looks as if it had been chipped away."—G.C.C.

the Companions be parted," is so defaced that one cannot read it. That this defacing has been intentionally done I think there can be no doubt, and I think it is quite a legitimate inference that it has been intentionally done to prevent any explanation being received of Bacon's epitaph. If it were not for the Latin paragraph preserved in the 1640 edition of the "Advancement of Learning" we would have no notion at all that the Meautys epitaph contained anything that had any reference to Bacon's epitaph. This paragraph, which the defacers had probably forgotten about, or perhaps did not know about, remains to give us a hint that there is something strange and unexplained about Bacon's tomb and that there was something explanatory to be found on Meauty's slab to put us on enquiry, and make us ask: "What is there hidden about Bacon that people were so anxious to keep hidden, and yet ultimately to reveal?"

I have space left to direct attention only very briefly to the remarks made by Charles Molloy in his "Address to the Reader," prefixed to the Second Part of the Third Edition of Rawley's "Resuscitatio," brought out in 1670 (Rawley died in 1667). Molloy says, speaking of Bacon, that he no sooner sought but obtained his Royal Master's mercy, "and then with a head filled up to the brim, as well with sorrow as wisdom, and covered and adorned with grey hairs, made a holy and humble retreat to the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune, till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest: Nor shall his most excellent pieces, part of which though dispersed and published at several times in his life time, *now after his death*\* lie buried in oblivion, but rather

---

\* My italics.

survive time, and as incense smell sweet in the nostrils of posterity."

It is quite certain that prior to 1626 Bacon did not make "a holy and humble retreat to the cool shades of rest." He was summoned to the first Parliament of Charles I. in 1625, and letters of his written in the early part of 1626 on public matters, show that up to April, 1626, he was before the public much as usual. His holy and humble retreat took place *after* that date, and it was "now" (in 1670) "after his death," that his most excellent pieces were being brought out by Molloy. I submit that Molloy's language can only refer to a retirement and death subsequent to 1626, and to a time of death perhaps many years subsequent to that date.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

#### BACON'S PRE-OCCUPATION OF MIND.

THERE is a letter from Bacon to Sir Thomas Bodley which provides us with proof that Bacon had been engaged in pursuits which absorbed his time to the exclusion of literary work. It makes a most interesting comparison with those sonnets (97-119), telling of Shakespeare's absence from his "sweet boy"; Bacon says:—

I do confess, since I was of any understanding, my mind hath in effect been absent from that I have done, and *in absence errors are committed*, which I do willingly acknowledge; and amongst the rest this great one which led to the rest: that knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a book than to play a part, I have led my life in civil causes, for which I was not very fit by nature, and more unfit by the pre-occupation of my mind.\*

---

\*Stephen's Letters, 1702, p. 19.

Shakespeare laments that fortune did not provide better for his life "Than public means which public manners breeds." He had "gone here and there," and acknowledges the errors committed in this "absence" :—

Accuse me thus . . . .  
I have frequent been with unknown minds  
And given to time your own dear-purchased right ;  
That I have hoisted sail to all the winds  
Which should transport me farthest from your sight.  
Book both my wilfulness and *errors* down  
And on just proof surmise accumulate.—*Sonnet 117.*

What wretched *errors* hath my heart committed  
Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never !  
How have mine eyes out of their spheres been fitted  
In the distraction of this madding fever !—*Sonnet 119.*

But though he had "given eyes" to those things for which his vision was not fitted, he will not accuse himself that he was false of heart. His mind was all the time pre-occupied for, he continues :—

O never say that I was false of heart  
Though absence seem'd my flame to qualify.  
As easy might I find myself depart  
As from my soul, which in thy breast doth lie.  
That is my home of love.

Bacon makes this further apology :—

This I speak to posterity, not out of ostentation, but because I judge it may somewhat import the dignity of learning to have a man born for letters rather than anything else, who should by a certain *fatality*, and against the bent of his own genius, be compelled into active life.

(*Advancement of Learning*, Bk. VIII.).

Montagu (*Life and Works of Bacon*) says : " Forced by the narrowness of his fortune into business, conscious



of his own powers, aware of the peculiar quality of his mind, and disliking his pursuits, his heart was often in his study, while he lent his person to the robes of office."

Bacon says : " I am better fitted to hold a book than to play a part." This is the tragedy of Hamlet's life. Hamlet enters " holding a book " when he should act, even though it is a part for which he " was not very fit by nature, and more unfit by the pre-occupation of the mind."

As Coleridge observes, " We see a great and enormous intellectual activity, and a proportionate aversion to real action consequent upon it." Hamlet is a university man, a poet—he writes " verses"—and a dramatist who sends forth his work as that of another. He has one true friend, Horatio, to whom he utters a magnificent essay on Friendship. Bacon had one true friend Tobie Matthew, for whom he wrote the *Essay Of Friendship*. Hamlet is dragged into public life against his bent, and is anxious to return to his studies. He complains that he is poor—a " beggar"—and laments, " I do lack advancement." Hamlet is robbed of his rights, and spied upon by his uncle. For many years Bacon appealed to his uncle Burleigh, that he lacked advancement, but he was continuously put off with promises, held down and spied upon by the Cecils.

Nobody can hear the " strains of woe " from the Sonnets, especially where Shakespeare complains of the " spite of Fortune," and that the world is bent his deeds to cross (S. 90) without catching the plaintive music of the soliloquies uttered by the courtier and scholar who had to " bear the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune."

Hamlet detests the " manners " of the Court, and expresses the opinion that they are :

More honour'd in the breach than the observance.

And here I should like to say more about the very important Sonnet (111), where Shakespeare laments that Fortune did not provide better for his life, "than public means which public manners breeds."

Not all Shakespeareans agree with Malone that "the author seems here to lament his being reduced to the necessity of appearing on the stage, or writing for the public theatre."

James Boswell (1821) points out that Shakespeare "would scarcely indulge in such bitter complaints against a profession which was rapidly conducting him to fortune as well as to fame." Halliwell-Phillips (*Outlines*, 8th ed.) agrees with this view. The German critic, N. Delius, observes that these lines "tell us only, in general, that the poet had been drawn into commerce with the world from considerations of a livelihood, and cannot withdraw from this in spite of the wish of his heart. Gerald Massey writes:—

The meaning, as illustrated by the context, is that the speaker has to live in the public eye in a way that is apt to beget public manners. . . . His public is the only public of Shakespeare's time, the court circle and public officers of the State.

Shakespeare writes of "Our public court" (*As You Like It*, I-3).

He shall endure such public shame as the rest of the court can possibly desire. (*Love's Labour Lost*, I., 1.)

In Sonnet 25, Shakespeare expressly says that Fortune had debarred him from *public* honours:—

Let those who are in favour with their stars,  
Of public honour and proud titles boast,  
Whilst I, whom fortune of such triumph bars,  
Unlook'd for joy in that I honour most.

16 What Shakespeare honours most, and brings him comfort and joy in the midst of all his sorrows, is his

Poesy. In the same way, when Fortune had barred Prospero from "public honours," he was comforted in the thought of his offspring, Miranda—representing, no doubt, the wonderful fruits of his creative genius.

A letter to Essex (1595) proves that Bacon was, at that time, carried away by the delights of Poesy. Whilst urging the Earl to proceed with his suit for the Solicitor's place, he says: "Desiring your good Lordship nevertheless not to conceive out of this my diligence in soliciting this matter that I am either much in appetite or much in hope. For as for appetite, *the Waters of Parnassus* are not like the waters of the Spaw that give a stomach, but rather they *quench appetite and desires.*"

R. L. EAGLE.

---

## FRESH LIGHTS ON TWELFTH NIGHT OR WHAT YOU WILL.

A COMEDY, THE SCENE OF WHICH IS LAID IN A CITY OF  
ILLYRIA AND THE SEA-COAST NEAR IT.

TO rightly understand this play we must try and visualise riverside London, in the out-of-door life of which so much of the time of its first audiences was passed.

Fairman Ordish, in his *Shakespeare's London*, notes how mighty a mart and great a port was Elizabeth's London. Knight's *London* shows how: "In the beginning of the seventeenth century the river Thames was at the height of its glory as the great thoroughfare of London."

Howell said: "It hath not her fellow, if regard be had to those forests of masts which are perpetually upon her," and "Foreign ambassadors affirm that the most glorious sight in the world, take water and land together, was to come upon a high tide from Gravesend

and shoot the bridge to Westminster." It was just there that flowery lawns swept down to the water's edge where swans floated, 'mid reeds and rushes. Music and revelry sounded from the mansions of the great, each of which had its own landing stairs. Blackfriars was the chief centre of busy life, whether from the fashionable world's point of view or from the trader's and navigator's. Its wharves were crowded always with bronzed sea-captains, and busy merchants, and light-hearted travellers home from Aleppo and Levantine ports.

Where late black monks sang and prayed, the highest nobility clustered, and on holy ground now a select and private Theatre under Her Majesty's special patronage, flourished. Where Dominicans not long before had set forth their Moralities and Mysteries, the Children of the Queen's Revels formed now a Conservatoire for the art training then so much in vogue.

Ordish points particularly to the topographical allusion to river-side London in Twelfth Night, assuring us that beneath "the Masquerade of foreign names in the Shakespeare Comedies lay tacitly the familiar scenes of England and London." "Let us enumerate," he says: "a few of the rents and holes in the Illyrian gauze which covers it." With the sea as its background this Comedy," according to him, is the chief of the group of sea-plays which so appealed to Elizabethan audiences. Not impossibly," he adds, "it was first performed in Blackfriars, and in Blackfriars Theatre."

With Ordish I heartily agree, the rugged region of *Epirus Nova* or *Illyris Graeca* had far less to do with Twelfth Night than the willows and the swans, and the landing stages of Queen-hythe and Puddle Dock, so inexpressibly dear to the heart of the citizens of that day. Puddle Dock, which we shall have occasion to



mention later, was the landing-stage just below Ireland Yard, where in Edward the VIth's reign were stored the tents, pavilions, masks and revels of Sir Thomas Cawarden, the Master of the Revels.

No wonder that Twelfth Night was one of the most popular of the immortal Plays. I quote again from Ordish: "There is little room for doubt that the Characters in the Illyrian Masquerade were drawn from the originals in Shakespeare's London." These I propose to unveil, one by one, proving that the more intimate we become with the originals the closer are the parallels. Mr. Cunningham, in his Introduction to the Reprint of Barnaby Riche's *Honesty of this Age*, says Twelfth Night was probably written in 1600 or 1601. Mr. Halliwell Phillipps gives January 6th, 1602 (Twelfth Night) as the probable date of its first appearance, preceding the performance before the Benchers and students of the Middle Temple on the Feast of the Purification, February 2nd, 1602. I am more inclined to think that the Temple performance preceded one given at Whitehall a few night after. Professional players were sometimes engaged for the great festivals of the lawyers, but as Manningham does not so describe those who played, I am free to hold my own opinion that Twelfth Night was presented on that and succeeding occasions during ten or twelve years as a Masque, or Play acted by Amateurs, and that it was not licensed for the public stage till 1610 or after.

#### TWELFTH NIGHT OR WHAT YOU WILL.

##### *Dramatis Personæ.*

Orsino, Duke of Illyria.—Ludovic Esme Stuart, Duke of Lenox.

Olivia, Princess and Countess.—Arabella, Princess and Countess.

Sebastian and Viola (Twins).—Sir William Seymour.

Sir Toby Belch, Uncle to Olivia.—Sir Gilbert Talbot, Uncle to Arabella.

Sir Andrew Ague-Cheek.—Sir Andrew Sinclair, and Duke Ulrich of Holstein.

Malvolio, Steward to Olivia.—Sir William Fowler.

Feste, Olivia's Servant.—Cutting, Arabella's Servant.

Maria, or Mary, Olivia's Gentlewoman.—Mary, Lady Talbot.

Scene.—A City in Illyria and the Sea-Coast near it.

Scene.—Blackfriars and its water-way.

Princess and Countess Olivia.

Mouse of virtue that purged the air of pestilence. A virtuous maid, of sweet perfections, that would admit no suit, no, not the neighbouring Duke's, who wooed with adorations, groans and sighs.

Of beauty truly blent, whose red and white Nature's hand laid on.

Of eyes grey with lids to them ; too proud, yet fair. She had no folly, was wisdom itself. (*Olivia* is Italian for Olive and Olive-tree, Minerva's emblem.)

Lady Olivia had a white hand, and a sweet roman handwriting. Her heart was of fine frame. She mourned a dead brother, and like a cloistress seasoned his dead love by watering her chamber with eye-offending brine, thus keeping his love fresh and lasting in her memory.

She harboured her Uncle Sir Toby Belch, but was nothing allied to his disorders.

A priest plighted her troth to the boy Sebastian underneath a consecrated roof, until she could safely avow the sacred tie with a celebration that accorded with her royal birth. This eternal bond, intended to be kept dark, was revealed by occasion before it was ripe.

This lady confessed to sad madness, and a most distracting phrensy.

Princess Arbella Stuart, Countess of Lenox.

This direct descendant of Henry VII. was Princess Royal. To Charles Stuart, her father, King James gave the Earldom of Lenox, which reverted to him at the death of his cousin, Mathew Stuart. But at Charles' death James repudiating Arbella's claim to the title and estates, created his cousin\* Esmé Stuart Duke of Lenox, and robbed Arbella of her rights. A picture of her is extant with Countess of Lenox upon it.

Numberless people have left their witness to the singular virtues of this Lady. James for one. Beaumont, the French Ambassador, writes to Henry the Great that :—" The people at Court speak freely of Arabella's virtues." Sir William Fowler, Queen Anne's Secretary, describes her in a letter to Lord Shrewsbury :—" That worthy and most virtuous Lady." Mistress Lanyer, wife of one of James' Household, eulogises her " beauteous soul " in a Poem. She connects Arabella, an acknowledged poet, with Minerva and the Muses. She calls her " Great learned Lady, rare Phoenix, whose fair feathers are your own." She is the " Fair Arabella " of a contemporaneous ballad. Her warm admirer, Sir William Fowler, calls her " The eighth wonder of the world," and " godly nymph, divine in soul, devout in life . . . and mirror bright were virtues doth reflex." " Her virtuous disposition, rare skill in languages, good judgment and sight in music, her mind free from pride, vanity and affectation, and her great sobriety in fashion of apparel and behaviour," are Sir John Harrington's description of her, while, as the translator of Orlando Furioso, he gives her exceptional praise for her Italian. " At thirteen she read French out of Italian, and English out of both much better than I could."

---

\* Father of Ludovic Esmé.

Fowler writes :—" She will not hear of marriage ; " she rejects all suitors, the highest and the lowest, even the fascinating Duke, her near neighbour at Puddle Dock, Blackfriars, from which place she signs letters. Of him we shall speak later, at present we have her own beautiful self to deal with. Her eyes were grey with heavy lids. As a child they had the true Minerva blue mingling with the grey. Her complexion was fair, and as her feathers were her own, and she had neither vanity nor affectation, we may presume so was the tint of her cheek. High spirited, and with a strong sense of what was due to her and her position, she may be called proud ; she herself says too proud in the following confession :—

" I have dealt unkindly, shrewdly (proudly) with him, and if any living have cause to think me proud (shrewd) it is he !"

If she was the devil she was fair and kind to her dependents, who were devoted to her.

Her " marvellous white hand " was one of her beauties, as it was that of Mary Queen of Scots, and it led to her discovery when she tried to escape out of England.

Mr. Alexander Webster, the possessor of a letter written by Arbella, assures me her hand-writing was " beautiful," while Mr. Inderwick, in his *Side Lights of the Stuarts*, alludes to it as " the small and distinct print-like hand of the Italian school."

Her heart beat tenderly for Robert, Earl of Essex. On Ash Wednesday, the anniversary of his execution, she writes to Sir Henry Brounker, sending him : " The ill-favoured picture of her grief." The " whole sad day " she spends shut up in her chamber. Bradley, in the *Life and Letters of Arabella*, quotes her words : " This fatal day," the new-dropping tears of some might make you remember it, if it were possible you



could forget. She writes : " Were I not unthankfully forgetful if I should not remember my noble friend." And again, " I have lost all I can lose, or care to lose, now I am constrained to renew those melancholy thoughts by the smarting feeling of my great loss, who may well say, I never had, nor never shall have the like friend." Professor Brandes believed Essex was the son of Mary Queen of Scots. I believe Arabella to have been her daughter ; in this case he would have been her brother.

The Jesuit Rivers wrote in 1601, " Some say (Arabella) is married to the Earl of Hertford's Grand-child, which is most false." (Cal. State Papers.) The National Biography says : " About 1602 Arabella formed an attachment for a member of the Seymour family." Just before the Queen's death Arabella writes of her " little, little love," who has " won her resolved heart." She alludes more than once to this " little love."

Collins, in his *Peerage*, quotes from Lodge, " of a childish connection of the Lady Arabella with young Sir William Seymour, Miss Cooper in her *Life of Arabella* says that in February, 1602, Arabella was arrested by the Queen for attempting a betrothal with William Seymour, and that the Queen " lost her repose " in consequence. We are told the intrigue—this love for a boy of fifteen by a woman of twenty-seven—both perilously near the throne—was frustrated by " the rigour of the Queen." [*National Biography.*]

How the eternal bond which was intended to be kept dark became known to the Queen remains a mystery. But it is open to surmise that the play of *Twelfth Night*, dealing, as I am showing it does, with the personal history of Arabella, may have been the means used not only to acquaint the Queen with the attachment,

but to enlist her sympathies for the chief characters of the Comedy. This view of the origin and aim of the play will be dealt with more at length later ; here we are still concerned with Arabella and her exact double, Olivia.

Arabella's letters in 1602 show what a highly strung nervous organisation hers was. Though at the close of her sad life she was distracted by grief, her nature was gay in the extreme. In one of her bright letters to her Uncle Gilbert she writes : " I make it my end only to make you merry, and show my desires to please you even in playing the fool, for no folly is greater, I trow, than to laugh when one smarteth." Genius, we know, is akin to madness, and this our Poet felt ; she confesses to a " scribbling melancholy, this is a kind of madness, and there are several kinds of it." She can laugh as heartily as she can cry. She is driven from her lady Grandmother's presence by laughter, which, as she writes, " upon good cause I cannot forbear." She extends her efforts to amuse, even to Her Majesty, and alludes mysteriously to " bringing laughter to the lips of an offended Queen by making herself and certain others ' merry in our parts.' " Some noble gentleman (whose name she conceals) she says has egged her on to ' play the fool in good earnest and make Her Majesty merry.' "

By which we learn that Arabella while she loved a mystery also had fits of merry and sad madness.

#### Duke Orsino of Illyria.

Called also Count. His soul breathed faithfulest offerings to the altars of Olivia, whom he loved with adorations, groans and sighs. She loved him not and rejected his suit, though she supposed him virtuous, knew him noble, of great estate, of fresh and stainless youth, in voices well divulged, free, learned and valiant,

in dimension and the shape of nature a gracious person. When he learnt she was betrothed to Sebastian he called her "sweet sister." He had a company of musicians who did his bidding. The Duke was a lover of music and garden flowers. He assisted at evening performances where songs delighted him, sung by a professional singer. Music he called Love's food.

Ludovic Esme, Duke of Lenox (of Albania, Scotland).

He inherited his father's title and estate of Lenox, while his brother Esme inherited the French title of Count D'Aubigny. He "longed after" Arabella (Beautiful Altar), but she rejected his suit. Their ages agreed, he was the elder by two years. His grace and personal attractions, accomplishments of music and dancing, made him chosen as an actor by Ben Jonson, in whose masks he appeared at Court, side by side, with the Countess Arabella. Lady Elizabeth Cust, our authority on the Stuarts, assured me that both he and his brother were good friends of Ben Jonson.

Ludovic Esme, which Camden says is the same name as *Amate* or *Amé*, masculine of *Aimée*, is the twin of Olivia's love-lorn Duke. He was her kinsman by birth, she his sweet cousin. In writing to her Uncle Gilbert she alludes to him as "The Duke," as though there were no other.

He and his brother came to London together in 1601. Esmé had a mansion in Blackfriars, and so green lawns and sweet flowers in all likelihood surrounded Arabella's love-lorn Duke, just as they did Olivia's. His company of players were forbidden in 1603 from performing in London (see *Alley's Memoirs*, p. 69), including, of course, professional musicians, who soothed him when his love outran his gentleness and discretion, for which two virtues this Duke was famed. Elizabeth was not

impervious to his agreeable personality, we are told. Had Cupid not played one of his mischievous tricks he and Arabella would have proved an ideal King and Queen, of Twelfth Night, or Albania, or Illyria, or of What you will! Ludovic and Arabella were well matched, and James desired their union, promising the young Duke, Arabella's senior by two years, the succession at the time when he himself had no children.

But the Lady Olivia and Arabella, victims of the mischief maker, alike set their somewhat mature affections upon a boy of fifteen.

Is it a coincidence, and nothing more, that the head of the Orsini in Rome at the end of the sixteenth century was Ludovic Orsino? The brothers Stuart were educated by their learned mother, Catharine de Balsac, at Berry, in France. Esmé, the younger, was brought up entirely by her.

The Duke of Lenox married for his third wife Francis Howard, the step-Grandmother of young Sir William Seymour—not his sister.

Sebastian and Cesario (Viola).

Cesario, "a young man well attended," arrives disguised at the gate of the Lady Olivia. Not old enough for a man, nor young enough for a boy, between boy and man. Very well favoured and speaking shrewishly (proudly), he says, "I am not what I am." He arrives with a message of love—a suit from another. He says his parentage is well, he is a gentleman, and the Lady Olivia says his tongue, face, limbs, actions and spirit give him five-fold blazon. His perfections creep in at her eyes with an invisible and subtle strength. His twin, young Sebastian, who arrives on shore with an older man who protects him, and fathers him, says his father is Sebastian of Messaline, so well known to the world. On landing he seeks the reliques of the town,



saying : " I am not weary—I pray you let us satisfy our eyes with the memorials and the things of fame that do renown this city." The travellers choose the Elephant, on the south side of the town, to lodge and feed in. Sebastian valiant, and a " young soldier," is ruled by Olivia, who after a contract by a Priest calls him Husband, which contract she intended to keep dark had occasion not revealed it before it was ripe. She bids her young love " take his fortunes up." " Be that thou knowst thou art, and then thou art as great as that thou fearest."

Sebastian says : " Having sworn truth ever will be true." Viola, surnamed Cesario, says of the Duke :—

" I love him more than I love these eyes, more than my life, more by all mores."

#### William Seymour.

A note of instructions written by Arabella suggests that the Earl of Hertford should send his Grandson to her disguised as the son or nephew of one of his attendants, an " ancient man " ; that the boy should be attended and guarded by him. The reason being that she had never seen him, and there was an idea that he, Edward, son of Lord Beauchamp, might prove an acceptable suitor ; Edward being aged 16, b. 1587. There was no mention then of William, aged 15. But there was mention made of a certain Owen Tudor, living in Wales, an " ancient " servant of Lady Shrewsbury's, who was asked by the Earl of Hertford's Lawyer to help move the marriage. Now, he had a son Owen (or he said he had) about this time, who, arriving at the gates of Arabella's Mansion, was admitted to be her page. A well-instructed page, too, for he fetched and carried her learned books to and from her library.

Lady Shrewsbury refused to listen to the offer of

marriage of Edward, moved by Tydder, without the Queen's knowledge or Acquiescence, but the page messenger remained as the constant companion of the wily Countess Arabella, who, in a letter to the Queen, confesses that she often does things without the knowledge of her Grandmother, Lady Shrewsbury, and throws out many dark hints about her "little little love," to whom it seems she at twenty-seven had lost her heart.

Anagrams were such a serious pursuit at that time it is not surprising to find in Cesario's sentence, "more than I love these eyes," etc.—"*Viola—the Seymore.*" Seymour or Seymore, being commonly spelled so.

William Seymour, Lord Beauchamp's second son, married the Lady Arbella in 1610. This man of intellectual tastes, more fond, as we are told, of his books than of exercise, was singularly suited to Arbella. History proclaims him a perfect example of good principle and honour. His "state was well, he was a gentleman;" and entitled to a five-fold blazon, for his great Grandmother was descended from five kings. His Grandfather, the Earl of Hertford, was husband of that Messalina divorced by Henry Earl of Pembroke. . . Catharine Grey, whom Elizabeth hated and in a fury cast into prison. Elizabeth chose to ignore the legality of Catharine's marriage with Seymore, and refused to name his son Lord Beauchamp, born in prison, as her successor, saying, "I will have no rascal's son on my throne." In her eyes Beauchamp was Seymore of Messalina.

As I have suggested, Illyria is Blackfriars, across the river the Elephant stands now. One asks, did a public or private House of that sign stand there in 1602?

- 17 Sir Toby Belch, Uncle to the Lady Olivia.  
His niece is nothing allied to his disorders. He loves

to eat, drink and be merry, but he keeps late hours with a prodigal companion in her house. He calls her a "Cataian," and adds, "We are Politicians." He is a quarreller who draws his weapon at every opportunity, and is an expert at delivering challenges. Olivia holds him in check, and chides him for his ungracious disposition, saying: "Will it be ever thus? Fit for the mountains and barbarous caves, where manners ne'er were preached."

He delights in a jest and "a device," and is a botcher up of "fruitless pranks," which incur Olivia's displeasure.

He is an intense admirer of Princess Olivia's maid-of-honour, or Lady-in-Waiting; especially of her wit. Fabian says he "married Maria," in recompence for a "device which rather plucked on laughter than revenge," and which made Monsieur Malvolio declare he would be revenged on the whole pack of them. The whirligig of time brought in the Revenges.

Sir Gilbert Talbot, Uncle to the Lady Arabella.

A prodigal, *Bon Vivant*, and a well known figure at Court when in favour. Was eldest son of the sixth Earl of Shrewsbury, to whom he was a sad disappointment. "He hath been a costly child to me," he writes, and complains of having "naught but sorrow" in his heir. Bradley speaks of him as becoming the great and glorious Earl of Shrewsbury, "irrespective of either intellectual or official distinction." Lodge, in his Illustrations, says: "The presence chamber of Gilbert Shrewsbury is crowded with spongers and creditors." Without the dignity of his father, endowed with a weak will and "not mentally vigorous," he was pugnacious, and under the thumb of his wife, on whose guidance and leadership he leaned. The old Earl George, his father, said "he had long been a disobedient son, but

he knew he had many good parts, but was over ruled by others." Gilbert answered he was not over-ruled by his wife. Francis Bacon thought differently, for he says : " It is a great person my Lord of Shrewsbury, or rather, as I think, a greater than he, which is my Lady of Shrewsbury."\* " I know," said his father also, " Gilbert Talbot will be too much ruled by those, . . . they do with him what they list, and so I have told his friends, but all will not help. . . . I know that the Queen affecteth not Gilbert Talbot." (Bradley, p. 73. Vol. 1.)

He and his wife were Roman Catholics, and suspected of furthering plots to put Arabella on the throne. Pope Clement the Eighth is said by Cardinal D'Ossiat to have suggested as Arbella's suitors the Duke of Parma and Cardinal Farnese, because they were in the succession from a daughter of Edward IV.

Arbella, a Protestant, was opposed to all such plots, and might very naturally be known as a Cataian to the plotters or " Politicians," by which name Catholics were known. Camden explains a Cataian, " coming from *chain*, for that he *chained* and fettered many good men here with linking together false surmises to their utter undoing." Page, in the *Merry Wives*, says :—

" I will not believe such a Cataian, though the priest o' the town, commended him for a true man."

Gilbert was a favourite Uncle of Arabella. And she spent much of her life under the same roof. Now at Hardwick, and again in London. Inderwick says she had a house of her own in Broad Street. Wherever she was her house was open to him and to Mary, his wife, who acted lady-in-waiting to this Princess of the blood. Arabella treated Gilbert *en bon camarade*, alternately amusing and scolding him. " I pray God,"

---

\* Letter to the King, Jan. 31st, 1614.



she writes, "that the cheese I send your Lordship prove as good as great (which few of you great Lords are by your leave)." She is always ready with her word in season to him. In one letter she upholds the innocency and virtue of her sex over his, reminding him that "ten thousand virgins went to heaven in one day," adding, if he thinks "there are some, but not many of us, that may prove saints, I hope you are deceived."

She is certainly not blind to his faults. "Not many rich," she tells him, "not many noble shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." She underlines this, adding, "So that riches and nobility are hindrances from heaven as well as our nature's infirmity." She begs him to pardon her for "preaching" to him and says, "It is not my function." Alluding to the many "kindnesses and favours" received from him, she yet says: "I will not be restrained from chiding you (great Lord as you are) if I find you are not willing to hearken to this good motion, or to proceed in it as I shall think reasonable."

She fears to be as funny as she would over the little Dutchkin, her suitor, whom apparently Gilbert takes under his wing. "I will not say we were merry at the Dutchkin lest you complain of me telling tales out of the Queen's coach; I could find it in my heart to write unto you some of yesterday's adventures, but that I conjecture you would not have this honest gentleman overladen with such superfluous relations." If this young unsophisticated Dane shared the drinking habits of his brother, Christian IV., and his Court, he was not the best companion for weak-kneed Sir Gely. The name Gilbert had odd shorts in those days. The old Earl called his son Gylbard. Spelling with apparently no rule makes the whole subject of Anagrams difficult for us to unravel. Gillye and Gilly were also used as shorts for Gilbert. Toby Belch is not altogether

impossible to find in Gilbert Talbot's name, which surname was in the Fifteenth century pronounced without the l, like Torby.

#### Sir Andrew Aguecheek.

A rich owl, a prodigal whom Sir Toby affects, had three thousand ducats a year, and was dear to him "two thousand strong or so." Impecunious Sir Toby bids him send for more money. Sir Andrew confesses to no more wit than a Christian or "an ordinary man," and to being a great "eater of beef." Of northern complexion his hair is like flax. He is suitor of the Lady Olivia, who rejects him. He is drunk most nights in the company of her Uncle, Sir Toby. He says: "I am a fellow of the strangest mind in the world, I delight in Masques and Revels. Shall we set about some Revels?" He has skill in capers and dancing, but will not compare himself "to an old man." Fabian says he "sails into the North of his Lady's opinion," and unless he shows "valour or policy, will hang like an icicle on a Dutchman's beard."

#### Duke Ulrich of Holstein; also

Sir Andrew Sinclair, Ambassador to Christian IV.

Brother of Queen Anne, Ul-rich—which being interpreted means Rich-owl. King James gave him £400, besides £100 a week for expences (Letters from Chamberlain). Lord Lumley wrote to Earl of Salisbury from his House at the Tower Hill. "The Queen's brother is come to Court, but not very rich any way." (A pun on his name Ul-rich.). (D. Carleton to Mr. Winwood, 1604.) Allusion is made to his brother Christian, the King of Denmark's want of wit. The King of Denmark ate Martlemas Beef when out hunting, in his "Boare's Houses." His brother had also an affection for meat, he was provided while in England with twenty dishes of it at every meal.

Of Scandinavian birth, his make up would be flaxen. A rejected suitor of Lady Arbella, he left England, sailed into the North, 1604. If he shared the vices of his brother Christian and his Court, he certainly would have been drunk every night. A young Prince of twenty-four, he is described "without much knowledge of the world, who speaks and acts with great freedom—A comely man." The Lady Arbella makes fun of him, calling him "the little Dutchkin," while Chamberlain writes: "The tilting this year will be at this Place, here is much practising, and the Duke of Holst is a learner, among the rest. Whose horse took it so unkindly the last day . . . that he laid his little Burden on God's fair earth."

In Nicol's *Progresses of King James*, p. 474, he says: "They say the Duke of Holst will come upon us with an after-reckoning, and that we shall see him on Candlemas Day night in a Maske. He hath shown himself a lusty Reveller all this Christmas."

Thus February 2nd comes into prominence with regard to a Masque. Was it Twelfth Night, and was the character of Sir Andrew Aguecheek introduced to afford Ulrich a chance of distinguishing himself in it, and vastly amusing his audience by sly hits at himself? The Anagram of Sinclair occurs possibly in "an icicle (on) a." When a Shakespeare character is drawn from two people, he escapes offending the originals. Unfortunately, not having any precise knowledge of Sir Andrew Sinclair, I am unable to discuss his share in Twelfth Night. Did he retire to the North, his ain countree, with the toothache? My memory plays me false, and I have no reference on the subject. He was in correspondence with the Lady Arbella from Copenhagen, and visited England to pave the way for Ulrich's suit.

With regard to the words of Aguecheek, "I will not

compare myself to an old man," where dancing and capering were in question—at the Revels on King James' accession, "Lord Nottingham, Lord High Admiral, the hero of the Armada, notwithstanding his great age, . . . danced so merrily at Winchester that he won the heart of lady Margaret Stuart, cousin of Lady Arbella, whom he married in September, 1603." (Inderwick, *Sidelight on the Stuarts*, p. 82.)

At the Queen's Masque, on Twelfth Night, 1604, on the creation of Prince Charles as Duke of York, the Spanish Ambassador (who was privately at the Court Masque and sat, as we hear, disguised), "took out the Queen, and footed it like a lusty old gallant." [Nicol's *Progress*, p. 473.] An allusion to the Duke of Holst follows, and his love of revelling.

In the former reign Sir Cristopher Hatton was the foremost dancer, and if his age is taken into account, a remarkable one.

#### Malvolio, Steward to Olivia.

A gentleman (Monsieur), stubborn and uncourteous, sick of self-love, who tastes with distempered appetite. Neither generous, guiltless, nor of free disposition. He is a kind of puritan, an affected ass, who can state without book, and utters it with great swarths. Is crammed, as he thinks, with excellencies. His ground of faith, that all who look on him love him. He is a gull. A sour fellow, with a sad face and an acrid tongue. He says he has *limed* his Lady. He is gulled into believing his lady is in love with him, by Sir Toby, Fabian, and Maria's device. A device or "Interlude," which Fabian says if it were played upon a stage he could condemn it as an improbable fiction. He is asked what Pythagoras' opinion was concerning wild-fowl. He is told to fear to kill a woodcock for fear of dispossessing the soul of his Grandam. Malvolio cries, "I'll be revenged on the whole pack of you."



The Duke Orsino desires that Malvolio should be pursued and "entreated to a Peace."

Sir William Fowler, son of Sir Thomas Fowler, Steward to Margaret, Lady Lenox.

A ridiculous personage, at once simpleton and buffoon. So described by Bradley the Biographer of Arbella, she goes on to say: "Extravagant as is his language, there is a ring of sincerity about his praises of the Lady (Arbella) which has led to the supposition that Fowler would, if he had dared, joined the ranks of her suitors."

Isaac D'Israeli, in an Article called the *Loves of the Lady Arabella* [Vol. I., New Series of the Curiosities of Literature] describes Will Fowl-er (or Fowl-Will) as "One of those butterflies who quiver on the fair flowers of a Court." In a note he says: "Will Fowler was a rhyming fantastical secretary to the Queen of James the First." His father was Executor to Arbella's Grandmother, Countess of Lenox. He writes extravagant admiration of Arbella to her Uncle Gilbert, "I fear I am too saucy and overbold," he writes from the Court at Woodstock, September, 1603, "but . . . I send two sonnets . . . the expressers of my humour and the honour of her whose sufficiency and perfections merit more regard than this ungrateful and depressing age will afford or suffer." "The ridiculous William Fowler," as Bradley calls him, was "certainly half in love with his Lady Arbella."

She quotes a letter in which he calls her: "More fairer than fair, more beautiful than beauteous, truer than truth itself."

Cooper tells us Fowler was a "simple" knight. And again that he is a "simpleton." "Foolish as may have been his manners and style of talking," says Cooper, another of Arabella's Biographers "he

gave utterance to his feelings with an artlessness that sneered at by all around him was yet kindly received by Arbella. She made no game of Fowler, never snubbed him or exhibited him as a triumph or ridiculous spectacle to her acquaintance." Whether Miss Cooper is right is open to question. That Will Fowler was the original of Malvolio of the later Twelfth Night seems likely. Leonard Digges says Malvolio was the favourite character in the play. At James' accession needy Scotchmen crowded to the Court, so Scotchmen were held up to ridicule on the stage. This Sir Simple (who possibly figures under the pseudonym of "Sir James Simple," in the political News Letters of that day), as Malvolio would have attracted laughter and applause from all. But he only claims acquaintance with his divine Lady Arbella, in September, 1603, in a letter to her Uncle Gilbert. Who was the Malvolio of the Feast of the Purification eight months before that? We have evidence that there was actually "a gentleman of the revenges" a year before that even.

An undated letter of Arbella to her Grandmother, Lady Shrewsbury, was enclosed by her to the Queen on 2nd February, the day of the Twelfth Night Performance at the Middle Temple. Arbella was away from home, possibly in London. It contains these curious words :—

"He taught me (a secret friend unnamed) that one might plead one errand and deliver another with a safe conscience. He assured me Her Majesty's offence would be converted into laughter when Her Majesty should see the honest cunning of the contriver."  
 . . . "I am desirous Her Majesty should understand every part and parcel of the Device, every actor, every action." . . . I will reveal some secrets of love concerning myself, and some others which will be

delightful to Her Majesty to understand. . . . I will inform Her Majesty of some matters whereof Her Majesty hath yet no manner of suspicion. I will offend none but my Uncle of Shrewsbury, my Aunt and my Uncle Charles, and them it will anger as much as ever they angered me, and make myself as merry at them as the last Lent they did at their own pleasant Device, for so I take it, of the Gentleman with the Revenges."

In Windsor Royal Library I have seen a copy of the Folio of 1623, once the property of Stevens, in which the title of Twelfth Night has been scored out, and Malvolio inserted instead, in what has been said to be Charles I. handwriting. He would have enjoyed the staging of Malvolio as his Mother's Secretary, whose ridiculous personality he knew so well.

The first Malvolio still remains a Mystery, which is the title or heading of the pages in Bradley's *Life of Arabella*, in which both this letter just quoted of Arbell's occurs, and another to Edward Talbot, February 16th, commencing "I am as unjustly accused of contriving a Comedy, as you (on my conscience) a Tragedy."

The Queen's collapse had already then supervened.

Malvolio is warned not to kill a woodcock; a Fowler snares one, whether or no he kills it. A gull is a feathered Fowl. Malvolio (= ill - will) says he has "limed" his lady, which is the technical expression of a Fowler. He "cons state," for he was engaged in Political negotiations with England, and possibly with France. He set forth what he alleged to be the "errors of Roman Catholics," and proves himself, not only by that but other things, to be as sour a Puritan as Malvolio. He devotes his leisure moments to poetry, relieving his mind by discoursing on: "worldlings," and "their sad remorse." Their

"organs of vain sense that transport the mind." And calls "trash" their "objects both of sight and ear." Masques? The Duke's last parthian satirical shot rather points to this. "Entreat him to a peace (piece)."

Feste, Servant to Olivia.

This servant neither clownish nor foolish, but wise and witty, is a professional musician, a singer who carries a tabor. His "turning away" is discussed as being as bad for him as a hanging. He is no "ordinary fool," like the Queen's fool Stone. He is an actor ready for a part any moment. He explains that the Mermaid Taverns are above the common alehouses. He says he is not the Lady Olivia's Fool, that she keeps none. He bids the Duke listen to the bells of Saint Benet, showing he hears them ring; and alludes to Saint Anne, says he lives by the Church.

Cutting, Servant to Arbella.

"She (Arbella) presents to the King of Denmark a gentleman of her establishment named Cutting . . . who is sent to Christiana (Copenhagen) apparently without the slightest regard to his wishes or feelings." (Inderwick. *Side light on the Stuarts*, p. 48.)

Queen Anne of Denmark made the request that Cotting should depart from Arbella's service, which he did about April or May. Prince Henry wrote as her Ladyship's loving Cousin to ask the same thing because his Uncle Christian desired: "one that could play upon the lute." Arbella writes to the King of Denmark a high testimonial of Cotting.

"Most august and potent King. . . . Your Majesty was desirous that my Servant Thomas Cutting should be sent to your Majesty that your Majesty might avail yourself of his services among the skilful performers on the harp . . . whom



after being entrusted to the most refined masters and to gratify me instructed in this art, I received, accompanied by no trifling recommendation both in his art, and for the ingenuousness, of his character, this very same person I send with no more trifling recommendation to your Majesty provided it met with your Majesty's good approval, being desirous to send if I could do so as well Orpheus and Apollo." Elsom in his *Shakespeare in Music*, says: "Many kinds of Lute . . . one sort possesses a number of open harp-like strings in addition to the guitar-like ones. . . The Lute was almost always used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the accompaniment to song." Shakespeare connects lute-playing with song "Orpheus Lute was strung with poet's sinews." There is little doubt Cutting was a singer to his lute. In carrying his lute he carried a tabor. Skeat says a Tambur or Tabor is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck and six brass strings, as well as a drum. In Elsom's book is a plate of an Elizabethan Lute-Player, perched on a high stool, with one pointed shoe resting on a rung of it, his lute in hand. Lady Arbella in the "Friars," as she designates Blackfriars in her letters, seated among the flowers and lawns of that willow-fringed fashionable precinct, often had such a dramatic and picturesque figure near her within earshot of St. Benet's bells, "one, two, three." St. Anne, by which Cutting's prototype swore, being the Parish Church of Blackfriars, with the Private Theatre adjoining.

#### Maria, Olivia's Gentlewoman.

This lady is so described by Olivia (Act I., S. V.). She is "Mistress Mary" to Feste and Malvolio. Of herself she says: "My name is Mary." Sir Toby says he

could marry her, Fabian says he has done so. Mary has Sir Toby under her thumb, calls him "Sweet Sir Toby," and adores him. He suggests playing his freedom at tray-trip and being her bond-slave. He calls her "Penthesilea" (Queen of the Amazons), "the youngest wren of nine," and "nettle of India." She is *au fait* with a new map of the Indies, in which new discoveries by the latest Navigator have added new lines.

Mary, a bit of a shrew, is cultivated and intellectual, with humour and excellent wit; not only enjoys a jest and a Device, but invents and carries one through. Her handwriting is the fashionable script of the day, and is the counterpart of the Princess's and Olivia's. She hates a Puritan as she does the devil; with fine scorn she describes Malvolio as "a kind of a puritan." She is in charge of the Buttery Hatch. Sir Toby calls to her twice for wine.

#### Mary, Arbella's Lady-in-Waiting.

Mary Cavendish married Sir Gilbert Talbot, and was, as we have seen, the better man of the two. In the Hardwick picture gallery she appears tall and commanding. Queen of the Amazons, Penthesilea, aided the Albanians (Illyrians?) The "desperate courage of these women" (the Amazons) is noted by Geropius Becanus in his *Amazonica*, while a more modern Becanus, Francis Bacon, says: "The Land of Amazons is where the whole government, public and private, yea, the Militia itself, was in the hands of women."

We have already noted that according to him this is the government that obtained in the Household of Gilbert Talbot.

Mary was the youngest bird of eight in the nestful of Bess of Hardwick, by Sir William Cavendish, her third Husband. Whether a ninth had been admitted as a

Ward—who can tell? Elizabeth, a quiet, meek girl, very unlike her mother or Mary, married Charles Darnley, to the fury of Elizabeth—queen. It is she who is the acknowledged mother of Princess Arbella.

If we paraphrase “ Here comes our nettle of India,” we get Toby’s meaning, I think. “ Here comes sweet Cavendish, rough and harsh to those who love her not, but to me an exhilaration and delight, because of her pungent flavour!” Sir Thomas Cavendish, Mary’s renowned kinsman, gave his name to Cavendish tobacco, a “ secret delight ” to those who take it. Indian Tobacco is said by a contemporaneous expert to possess “ a certain pleasant flavour.” Camden says the “ Indian plant ” partakes of the stinging properties of snuff, as well as of the exhilarating ones of Tobacco. The Middle Temple Library, where Twelfth Night was exhibited at its birth, possessed a unique example of Cavendish’s terrestrial Globe, made in 1592, a comparative novelty. In Spenser’s *New and Old* (p. 228] he speaks of a new Map drawn out of Cavendish’s Journey by Mercato, Hondus, and others, and the Nat. Bio. explains that a “ blue line showeth voyage of Master Candish,” and “ a red line Drake’s.” Sir Thomas Cavendish, Navigator and Privateer, sailed from Plymouth, 22nd July, 1586, round the Globe; returned 9th September, 1588; sailed again, 6th August, 1591, and died off Brazil, 1593, of chagrin. He discovered Saint Helena to the English. There were great doings at Greenwich when Sir Thomas came home from his adventures. He accompanied the expedition to Virginia, and made the second and shortest voyage round the world up to that time made. He was one of the great Navigators of the Elizabethan age, was born 1560, studied at Cambridge. (“ Students’ Encyclopædia.”)

Tobacco, as described by the learned, is “ in taste

biting and in temperature hot." Mary, Lady Shrewsbury, partook, as we hear from history, of her Mother Bess of Hardwick's character. I quote at random. She was "free-tongued," "easily infuriated," of "nature excitable." "Clever, managing," having "vitality and joy in intrigue." Rawson, in his "Bess of Hardwick" speaks of her shrewd look in her picture and of the "humorous sparkle" in her face. She certainly was a favourite Aunt of Arbella, who was hardly ever without her loyal companionship. She is described as extravagant, and loving State and Pomp, and accused by angry Elizabeth of keeping up royal state for Arbella. She attended that Princess at Court and was to all intents and purposes her Lady-in-Waiting. She was a Catholic.

She seems to have taken the oath of Service to Queen Elizabeth and is spoken of by Arbella in a letter to Gilbert as the Cup bearer designate to Queen Anne.

With Mary I close my list of Types and Prototypes, which all, as I think, form a fairly perfect mosaic. The pattern of which would have, without doubt, been received as "excellent fooling" by the Theatre goer of the Sixteenth and the early part of the Seventeenth century.

The Venetian Ambassador writes, 18th Feb., 1610, that Arbella complained that some *comici publici* intended bringing her upon the Stage. Not till then was Twelfth Night played by Professionals, as I think.

I have little doubt that Francis Bacon was the mysterious gentleman who, collaborating with Arabella, first produced that masquerade with the aid of Duke Ludovic's private company of actors. Manningham's Diary says: "The Queen since Shrovetide has become fixed in her gaze and silent, tho' she has her mind and memory." The Venetian



Ambassador writes, the Queen was in her normal health until February 2nd, when she collapsed, and died a month later. He accuses Arabella of being *l'omicida della Regina.*" Was she not only the heroine but one of the authors and actors of Twelfth Night? *Chi lo sa !*

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

---

### BACON AND SCOTLAND.

THE play of "Macbeth," first presented in the Folio of 1623 betrays on the part of its author such knowledge of the scenery and "local colour" as to impress Shakesperians with the belief that the author at some time in his career visited Scotland. The record of one Dr. Forman is that he saw the play performed in, or prior to 1610-11.

Bacon was in the English Parliament which existed from 1604 to 1610, and was the first appointed of the twenty-eight English Commissioners for arranging with the Scotch the terms of Union of the Kingdoms. Preliminaries were signed on December 6th, 1604, as drawn up by Bacon and the Lord Advocate. His considerations reported to the King were "to acquit the trust that has been reposed in me." Referring to the discussions expected on the subject at the Autumn meeting of Parliament Sir John Harrington writing in July, 1606 (See "Nichols Progresses of James I.") said "Bacon is to manage all the affair: as who can better do these State jobs." Mr. Spedding could find nothing out about Bacon's movements between May 6th, 1606 (when he married Alice Barnham) and August 4th of the same year.

In *L'Histoire Naturelle*, 1631, as Mr. Cunningham has pointed out, ("Bacon's Secret Disclosed"), Bacon mentions as facts the hearing of an echo at Edinburgh,

and seeing in Scotland some "body which had burst its coffin." Oliver Lector in "Letters from the Dead to the Dead" refers to some intimacy between Bacon and Napier of Merchiston (near Edinburgh) who printed a book of Logarithms in 1614.

Seeing the great advantage of ascertaining the views of leading Scotsmen in Edinburgh upon an important State business of which he had charge, the probabilities are that Sir Francis Bacon and his bride visited Scotland in the summer of 1606. Amongst the papers of Napier of Merchiston, Drummond of Hawthornden, or other Scotch statesmen, there may be recorded some note confirmatory of this presumed visit.

#### PARKER WOODWARD.

NOTE.—The passages in "L'Histoire Naturelle," where Bacon's remarks show that he had been in Scotland, are as follows :—

Livre II., chapitre IX. "De la reflexion des sons," p. 116.

"I have formerly heard the Echo of Charenton, near Paris 'repeating the same thing seven or eight times quite distinctly, "and I remember that near Edinburgh in Scotland, there is "one that repeats the *Pater noster* from the beginning to the "end."

And again :

Livre VI., chapitre V. : "Du mouvement de quelques animaux après leur mort," p. 373.

"I have seen, nevertheless, in Scotland the body of a gentleman, very big and powerful, who had had his head cut off ; "and being placed at once in a wooden coffin, burst it with "great force. But of that I cannot give the reason."

The writer of this note is an Edinburgh man, and has no knowledge of such an echo, or the tradition of such, as Bacon mentions. There is in the ruins of Dunkeld Cathedral—or used to be some 50 years ago—a fine echo, that was tested by visitors when such phenomena attracted more attention than they seem to do now. Possibly when the Cathedral was intact the echo was better, and may have fulfilled Bacon's conditions. The fact that Dunkeld is close to where "Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill, Shall come against him"—(Macbeth Act. IV., Sc. I. 93) would make the record of the echo doubly interesting.—ED., "BACONIANA."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### SOME ANAGRAM SIGNATURES FROM "DU BARTAS."

By J. SYLVESTER.

#### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

The 1633 Folio was the Third Edition of the "Divine Weekes and Workes" of Du Bartas by J. Sylvester: and I propose to deal chiefly with this fine edition in the present brief Article. The first edition was in Quarto in 1605, and I will only allude to that Edition for one illustration.

The first word after the Frontispiece in the 1633 volume is "Anagrammata," and the first line of the first poem contains an anagram of the name of the King, James Stuart, in the phrase "A Just Master." The same stanza closes with an anagram on the Author's name, "Josua Sylvester" in the phrase "Voy Sire Saluste"; and lest the reader should not observe this anagram, it is repeated at the close of the following stanza, where you are distinctly told that the phrase is an Anagram of the Author's name.

I mention these facts to indicate that every effort is made by the Author to point the Reader's attention to look out for Anagrams in the book under our consideration.

On the second page (un-numbered) of the Volume is a sigillum, or ornamental device, containing the following inscription: "Sylvestres Nove Musæ": Perhaps this is intended to suggest "Sylvestres Novæ Musæ," which might be a pun on the Author's name and also mean "New Sylvan Songs": as written in the text the words will not translate into English, and it is obvious in the original that the M in "Musæ" is formed by J.V.I., and this is a necessary proceeding for the sake of the hidden Anagram which reads, "I. SEE. A. SLY. SWINE'S. TREW. O."—Of course O = cipher.

The first stroke of the M is a J exaggerated in size to draw attention to the composite character of the M.

"True, O" is constantly alluded to in Anagram messages of the Period; I will give an example of this. On the Title-page of Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*, 1612, are two mottoes: "Vivitur ingenio, cetera mortis erunt," and "⁂ENTE VIDEBOR." Examination shows that the monogram forming the first two letters of the word "Mente" is really M.F. and not M.E., and the enclosed Anagrams in the two sentences run as follows: "I. AM. WRITING. A. SECRET. IN. TRVE. O. IN. TRVE, O. TRVE. O. MINDE. F.B."

On the Title Page of the First Weeke of Du Bartas, in the place where the Author's name might appear, is the motto "Acceptam refero"; this motto is repeated again, at least ten times in equally important positions on title-pages in the Volume under discussion. It is placed near a diagram representing phases of the moon, so as to appear to have some connection therewith, but its real import I believe is to conceal the signature in Anagram.

"MEE. A. FAT. PORCCER.

There is no "K" in Latin, so the double "C" has to be substituted for "K."

In addition to these eleven signatures in Anagram, are, on three important title pages, two more mottoes occurring on one sigillum, "JVSTVS. VIVET. FIDE. R.Y." and "DEVs PROVIDEBIT."

These mottoes, like the double motto quoted above from Peacham contain a consecutive Anagram signature "I. FRY. IN. STEW'D SVET. SVET. I. PROVIDED. B."

Note the N is formed by joining I. and V.

I find the phrase "stew'd suet" frequently occurring in the anagram references to fried Bacon. Here I will digress for a moment from the third Edition of Du Bartas and turn to the first Edition in order that I may record another reference to "stew'd suet" in Anagram, only this time there is, I think, a palpable hint at "Shakespeare" also.

The First Edition of Du Bartas (Quarto 1605) has on several Title Pages a sigillum containing a motto which is also found in Spencer's *Faërie Queene*, 1613, and also in the 3rd Edition of Du Bartas and in other fine works of the period.

The motto in 1605 Du Bartas is as follows:

ET. VSQVE. AD. NVBES. VERITAS. TVA. P.S.

The additional P.S. only occurs (so far as I know) in the first Edition of Du Bartas: The Anagram signature, contained in it, I believe to be

QVASATE. SPEAR. STEW'D. IN SVVET. B. (See Note\*).

In Spencer's *Faërie Queen*, 1613, and in the 3rd Edition of Du Bartas and in Lodge's *Josephus*, 1640, the above motto occurs without the additional P.S., and thus it also occurs in several other works of the period: In this form, and without the P.S. I believe the enclosed Anagram should read as follows:—

SAVE. QVEST. AND. STAVE. WRIT. B.

"Queste" of course, means "Question" and the motto might be a proverb: "Avoid being questioned and you won't be served with a writ."



It is very frequent in the works of this period that the motto " Et usque ad nubes veritas tua " occurs in the same sigillum with another motto as follows :—

DEDIT. OS. HOMINI. SVBLIME. which contains in Anagram I. MVST. HIDD. ME. IN. SLIE. OO. B.

But this last motto is improved upon by the addition of two extra letters on the last page of " The Faërie Queene," 1613. There the Motto runs as follows :—

DEDIT. OS. HOMINI. SVBLIME. H.D. which contains the improved anagram.

IN. SLIE. HOOD. I. MVST. HIDD. ME. B.

I infer, of course, that the remaining letter B. stands as usual for Bacon's initial.

This last page of the 1613 Faërie Queen has what might be intended for a date 16012, immediately placed over the sigillum containing the motto and the sigillum has a white line scored across the centre of the plate, pointing straight towards the cipher O in the 16012. I cannot explain the meaning of this.

The date on Title-page being 1613, why should the last page be dated 1612, with the addition of a O. in the centre ?

This O. stands immediately over the plate containing the last Anagram quoted above, and I think refers to the Anagram.

BEN. HAWORTH BOOTH.

---

\*NOTE ON " QUASSATE SPEAR."

---

" Quassate Hastam " would signify " Shake Spear " in Latin if, therefore, it were desired to find a synonym for " Shake Spear " in English, in that golden age when the best literature was saturated with Latin phrases, what would be more likely to occur to the writer's mind than " Quassate Spear ? " The single or double " S " at this period might be a matter of taste, or merely of convenience to fit the anagram, or perhaps it might depend on whether the author connected the word with the Latin " Quasam Hastam " or " Quassatam Hastam," both of these signifying " A Shaken Spear."

Moreover, it is certain that the word " Quassate " had been already adopted and included into the English language : it appears in the English Dictionaries of the period : Phillips' Dictionary, 1658, and Bailey's Dictionary (the fourth edition of which appeared in 1728) give " Quassation : a shaking or brandishing." " To Quassate : to shake or brandish." I have not at present access to any other dictionary of the period.

"Quasate Spear" [or "Shake Spear"] in this anagram is associated with the phrase "Stew'd in suet"—the usual method of cooking the delicacy referred to in the redundant letter B. for "Bacon," which remains over for "Signature," to complete the Anagram.

B. HAWORTH-BOOTH.

Presented to the Bacon Society of London by the Authors,  
Dr Hyland C. Kirk, A.M. (Amherst College, Mass.), Elmer  
W. Marshall (Yale University) and Robert Atwater Smith,  
Genealogist and Historian.

A TRUE RECORD OF THE LIFE of "willm Shagsper" (1563-1616) OF STRATFORD. Collected from manuscript Records by a Genealogist of over a third of a century's experience and study.

1563.—"willm Shagsper (1563-1616) was born before April 23, 1563, O.S. (this by our modern calender would be May 6th.) See the inscription on the tablet on the wall of Trinity Church, Stratford, which plainly states that he was 53 years old at the time of his death on Apl. 23, 1616. See also the MS. record, made at Stratford some time between 1650 and 1688, by Rev. Wm. Fulman (1632-1698.) For facsimiles, see Halliwell's "Outlines" Vol. 1, pg. 257, and Vol. 2, pg. 71, 10th ed. 1898. Copy in Washington Public Library. Photo reproductions of these facsimiles in possession of the writer.

Apl. 26, 1564. On this date "Gulielmus, filius Johannes Shaxsper" is recorded in a list of baptisms at Stratford. Notice how some "Shaxsper fanatic" has attempted to change the letter "x" to a "k." Two loops have been added (the smaller loop not being considered long enough) to make the letter appear as a "k." The name of Shaxsper's father John is to be found written with an "x" in the Stratford records nearly a score of times. Fourteen facsimiles are printed in "Outlines." Tracings of them are in possession of the writer. A facsimile of record of baptism is on pg. 34 of H. W. Mabie's "Life of Shakespeare," N.Y., 1901. On pg. 406 is a facsimile of the "Record of Burial," the name is there written "Will Shakspur." Photo copies in possession of the writer.

1565.—Of the signatures of nineteen of the prominent men of Stratford, whose names were attached to an official document in 1565, thirteen are signatures by mark. A facsimile of the marks of these (finely educated) men is to be found in "Outlines" 9th Ed., Vol. 1. pg. 41. (This 9th Ed. is in the Library of Congress.) One of the thirteen "Marksmen" was "John Shaxsper, father of "willm." In 1587 more than one-half

of twenty-seven prominent men of Stratford could not write their names. Here we have an illustration of the wonderful effect of the education that was obtained in that famous Stratford Grammar School. It might be noted here, that besides "willm Shagsper" no native of Stratford within the years of 1560 to 1590 ever attained the smallest semblance of a reputation as an Author. How, when and where, did "willm" acquire the learning that is to be found in every step in the poems and dramas attributed to William Shakespeare.

Nov. 28th, 1582.—A "Marriage Bond" for "willm Shagsper" and "Ann Hathwey" is found on record. The name of "Shagsper" appears twice and "willm" four times. As "willm" had arrived at the age of maturity, this spelling of his name should always be used, for he himself was never able to spell or write his name. Facsimiles are to be found in Gray's "Shakespeare's Departure," etc., London, 1905; In New Shakespeareana of July, 1906. See "Shaxsper could not Write," by Wm. H. Burr, A.M., Washington, 1886 and 1906. Read BACONIANA of Jan., 1913, pg. 57, in L. of C. Shagsper was "forced" by John Richardson and Fulk Sandels, friends of the bride to marry the woman he had seduced. The "Premature Susanna" was baptised May 26th, 1583, inside of six months from Nov. 28th, 1582. She may have been born a few weeks after that date.

1587.—In September of this year, "Shagsper" must have been in Stratford for at that time he, with his father and mother, made a transfer of property to his cousin John Lambert, according to Halliwell's "Outlines." Some time in this year of 1587 he disappears from Stratford. The tradition is that he was forced to flee by Sir Thomas Lucy on account of his poaching and thieving habits. No record of him in Stratford is found until 1596, when in October of that year he applies for a coat of arms in the name of his father. He made several false statements in connection with that effort to procure the "Arms." The name is there written "Shaxsper." See facsimiles on page 19 of D. H. Lambet's "Shakespeare Documents," London, 1904. Read "Bacon Nonsense" and Edwin Read's Books published in Boston, Mass.

1587-1596.—During this period "Willm" may have lived in London. The account of an assignation made by Shagsper "sometime between 1590 and 1598 (as related by John Manningham in his "Diary" of March 13th, 1601-2) to outwit his comrade Richard Burbage, is the only record of a speech made by "Shagsper" while in London. It was: "William the Conquerour was before Rich. 3." See Wm. H

Edward's "Shaxsper not Shake-speare," pg. 266. Read *BACONIANA* of Jan., 1913, pg. 57. Read Donnelly's "Great Cryptogram." Also *BACONIANA*, July, 1910, pg. 170.

1593.—Until after 1593, when Sir Francis (1561-1668) invented the pen-name "Shakespeare," the name he signed to the famous "Venus and Adonis" letter of dedication, the name Shakespeare or "Shake-speare" has never been found in any of the Stratford Records in connection with "willm Shagsper." It was always written "Shax" or "Shak" or "Shag" and never written Shakespeare or Shake-speare. Edmund Malone, regarded as one of the greatest of Shake-speare authorities, in a letter to Rev. Mr. Davenport, Rector of Trinity Church, states that the name was never written with a final "e" until after 1650. Mr. Malone saw these records in the 18th century, when the ink was much less faded than it is now in the 20th century. See "Outlines," 9th Ed., Vol. 2, pg. 399. Read G. G. Greenwood's "The Shake-speare Problem restated." London, 1908. "Is there a Shake-speare Problem?" Dr A. Morgan's "Shakesperian Myth," 1880.

1596-1616.—During these years "willm Shagsper" was living at Stratford. There is some mention of "willm" in the Stratford town records almost every year from 1595 to his death on April 23, 1616. (According to our present calendar that date in the 17th century corresponds with May 6th. *Vide* "Who wrote the Plays and Poems," by Maj. G. H. P. Burns, London, 1908). The statements that "willm" was living in London after 1596 are not substantiated by anything in the way of documentary evidence. Consult "The Greatest of Literary Problems," by Hon. James P. Baxter, Boston, 1915. Extract from pg. 40. According to Rev. John Ward, Rector at Stratford in 1661 "Shakespear, Drayton and Ben Jonson had a merrie meeting, and it seems drank too hard, for Shakespear died of feavour there contracted."

ROBERT A. SMITH.

[NOTE.—In view of the discussion that has gone on in the pages of *BACONIANA* over the question: Did Bacon die in 1626? it is interesting to see that our American friends plainly assume the dates 1561-1668 for Bacon. — Ed. *BACONIANA*.]

### A FEW QUERIES.

LETTER FROM ANTHONY BACON, 1581.  
TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

(1) This letter to Burleigh giving a continental route for



Francis, if dated French style, would be February, 1581, but if English style, February, 1581-2. Which is intended? If not the French style, a deduction of importance would end in tragedy—be killed by a fact.

#### HALF-BROTHER ANTHONY.

(2) At page 101, *BACONIANA*, 1911, is quoted from State records that King James gave Francis Bacon a pension of £60 per annum, in consideration of good and faithful and acceptable service by Francis and *his half-brother*, Anthony Bacon." Can someone explain this ambiguous entry?

#### COOPER'S ATHENAE CANTERBRIEENSIS, 1861.

(3) Why is a full biography given of Anthony Bacon and none of Francis Bacon? Both were at Trinity College.

#### FELICITIES OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

(4) The Latin of above is declared to be defective. Has any Baconian tried to translate it? The Eulogy was doubtless true to Bacon's dictum that the dead are entitled to good fame. It states that the Queen in her vigorous years was able to "bear children, that she had no brother or uncle and had no props of her government, but *those of her own making*. This, if a simulation, would not exclude a husband and sons.

Another statement was "Childless she was and left no issue behind her." Was this a simulation that in the entire absence of proof, she was in law childless and without issue? Of course, Francis was answering a pamphlet impugning the late Queen's morality.

#### BOLTON'S HYPERCRITICA.

(5) Has anyone carefully examined this pamphlet from a Baconian or Rosicrucian point of view? It is to be found in Vol. II. of Hazlewood's *Ancient Critical Essays on English Poets*. It was written about 1618 and not printed until 1722. It gives prominence to the Earl of Essex, and Sir Henry Savile, his great friend. It calls itself a Rule of Judgment for writing or reading our History and gives prominence to Boccalini the Rosicrucian who published the *Universal Reformation of the Whole Wide World*.  
P. W.

#### THE "PROCREATION" SONNETS.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

DEAR SIR,—I do not think any Baconians are carried away by the popular theory that in Sonnets 1-17, "Shake-speare" is

exhorting either Lord Southampton or any other nobleman to marry and beget children for the sake of his love towards the poet ("For love of me.") Sir Sidney Lee takes these Sonnets to be "the poet's appeal to a young man to marry so that his youth and beauty may survive in children." Such is the veneration for "authority" that whatever is said by a "Professor" of public eminence is bound to capture the imaginations of the many. Sir Sidney Lee identifies this young man with the Earl of Southampton, and as his poet is "John Shakespeare's eldest son," it seems too absurd to contend against. Reason confounds as soon as we apply it. It is doubtful if even Francis Bacon would have taken the extreme liberty to send sonnets to Southampton worded like these.

It has, however, been argued that in the Sonnets the author is speaking to himself, and that they are the meditations of Francis Bacon. He was in appearance and age just such a man as the writer of the Sonnets, and the "young man" whose "painted counterfeit," Shakespeare has before him seems drawn after the Hillyard portrait of Francis Bacon, and Bacon might well have desired to see that lovely youth reproduced. But he realises that Nature has given him more bountiful gifts than other men and that his duty is to convert to store not in children of the flesh which, he says in the Essay of Children hinder great enterprises, but in "heirs" of the "invention."

There are some lines by Thomas Randolph (1638) which are significant :—

Why do I prate  
Of women, that are things against my fate ?  
I never mean to wed  
That torture to my bed.  
My Muse is she  
My love shall be.  
Let clowns get wealth and heirs ; when I am gone,  
And the great bugbear, grisly death,  
Shall take this idle breath,  
If I a poem leave, that poem is my son.

(*Ode to Mr. Anthony Stafford.*)

Shakespeare writes :—

So thou thyself out-going in thy noon  
Unlook'd on diest, unless thou get a son.

Yours truly,

R. L. EAGLE.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I have come across, for the first time, a charming little volume, entitled, "*Thoughts That Breathe and Words That Burn*," from the Writings of Francis Bacon; Selected by Alexander B. Grosart. (London, Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, 1893).

At page 182, Dr. Grosart points to an interesting Bacon-Shakespeare parallelism. Bacon says of Perkin Warbeck (*Life of Henry VII.*) that he "in all things did notably acquit himself; insomuch as it was generally believed (as well amongst great persons as amongst the vulgar), that he was indeed Duke Richard. Nay; himself, with long and continued counterfeiting, and with often telling a lie, was turned by habit almost into the thing he seemed to be, and from a liar to a believer."

Dr. Grosart notes that Bacon draws this from the chronicler Speed, and that the same thought appears in *The Tempest* :—

Like one,  
Who having unto Truth, by telling of it  
Made such a sinner of his memory,  
To credit his own lie—he did believe  
He was indeed the Duke.

The editor makes the following comment upon the parallelism :

"It is marvellous how Bacon and Shakespeare alike transmute the least suggestion of arid chroniclers into imperishable stuff."

In his admirable preface, Dr. Grosart confesses his inability "to represent so splendid an intellect and so incomparable a stylist by the present volume," and he mentions Bacon's "inestimably perfect literary workmanship," exclaiming, "Here is no mere artizan of words, but an artist of cunningest faculty!"

The introduction concludes :—

"Finally, I cannot help expressing my sense of the discredit due to our literature by the continuous quotation of Pope's perverse couplet on the great, if human Chancellor, as though it were true, whereas it was out and out false. The wrong is the more inexcusable inasmuch as Spence's *Anecdotes* revealed that Pope did not believe his own couplet; only it was too smart and good a thing to be suppressed."—I am, dear sir, yours truly,

R. L. EAGLE.

19, Burghill Road, Sydenham, S.E.





